



Bulletin

hacking
926
Feb. 11 '57

RECEIVED

APR 1 1957

MIAMI, FLA. PRESS

March 25, 1957

Vol. XXXVI, No. 926

**CONGRESS PASSES JOINT RESOLUTION ON
MIDDLE EAST** • *Statements by President Eisenhower
and Secretary Dulles, Announcement of Ambassador Richard's
Departure, and Text of Joint Resolution* 480

**SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE OF
MARCH 5** 482

**INTERLOCKING ELEMENTS IN OUR NATIONAL
SECURITY** • *by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy* 475

**GERMAN FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS UNITED
STATES** • *Text of Joint Communique* 490

**U.S. DELEGATION LEAVES TO ATTEND THIRD
MEETING OF SEATO COUNCIL** 493

**SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SOUTH-EAST
ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION** 496

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXVI, No. 926 • PUBLICATION 6468

March 25, 1957

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Interlocking Elements in Our National Security

by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy¹

The subject I should like to discuss is the interlocking role of the various elements going into our national security. In essence these boil down to four elements—political, military, economic, and psychological. These elements have been graphically described as deals, force, goods, and ideas. Each must be considered in relation to the others. And it is only in recent years, the years starting with the outbreak of World War II, that our Government has become fully aware of the significance of these elements in our national security and has sought to coordinate all our national resources to achieve a balanced national security policy. The soldier and the diplomat must work together, and they must work with the other groups representing segments of our national strength.

The making of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President. He relies in particular on the Secretary of State for advice and guidance. The basic objective of our foreign policy is the promotion of the welfare and security of the American people. That is the point of departure in everything we undertake, and of course in it is reflected the spiritual, moral, and material posture of this country, which rests upon established principles asserted and defended throughout our national history. Both our people and the Government are dedicated to the dignity, equality, and freedom of the individual. These ideas and our institutions which maintain them provide the bulwark of our free society. From these things our national will is derived and the policies which express it.

To translate our national will into specific poli-

cies and actions is one of the major endeavors of the Government. A number of agencies take part in this operation, in particular the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the United States Information Agency, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Other departments like Treasury, Justice, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, as well as the Atomic Energy Commission, have a keen interest in many of our foreign-relations problems and have an important role in working these out.

In general the State Department is the channel through which the other agencies deal with foreign countries. Today it has over 12,000 American employees. About half of these are stationed abroad. Even so, the State Department is one of the smallest Cabinet-level agencies, only the Labor Department being smaller.

Under State Department administration the United States has 270 posts overseas in 105 countries. Seventy-seven of these posts are embassies, the latest just having been established 3 days ago at Accra in the new state of Ghana. Our budget this year for the conduct of foreign affairs is \$155 million.

I cite these figures to give you some idea of the size of the State Department. In terms of personnel and money spent it is a relatively small operation. But in terms of responsibility for coordinating the formulation and execution of foreign policy it has a major role, which is of course carried out in cooperation with many other agencies.

Formulating Strategic Policy

The gravest questions of all in our foreign policy, the broadest matters affecting war and peace,

¹ Address made in the Greater Issues Course at The Citadel, Charleston, S.C., on Mar. 9 (press release 123 dated Mar. 8).

fall under the consideration of the National Security Council. This Council, strengthened and enlarged under President Eisenhower, is charged under law with coordination of political, military, and industrial policies to advance the security of the United States. It consists of the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who are permanent statutory members. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are the principal military advisers to the Council. The Central Intelligence Agency is under the National Security Council and is its intelligence adviser. High officials of the other departments may be appointed to the Council from time to time as circumstances require.

To make sure that the national security policies approved by the President are carried out effectively, the Operations Coordinating Board was set up in 1953. The Ocb has somewhat broader representation than the Nsc and is at present under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter. It too is a very busy group with a broad complex of operational problems to tackle.

The basic purpose of these planning efforts is to formulate strategic policy. In war you have found that often the best defense is an offense and that no offense is likely to prosper unless the defensive terrain has been prepared. The situation is much the same in the conduct of foreign policy.

Our strategic policy is defensive as it seeks to deter or defeat the expansion of communism. It is offensive as it seeks to widen the area of freedom in the world and to create conditions which in time may cause the Communists to alter their methods and revise their goals.

The overshadowing threat to our security today is found in the hostility and strength of international communism. Our basic endeavor is to meet that threat without destroying fundamental American values and institutions or damaging our own economy.

We are a moral people. We reject the concept of preventive war. So our policies are designed to affect the attitudes and policies of international communism and, over time, to reduce as best we can expansionist and aggressive policies on their part.

Strength of Communist Bloc

The Communist bloc has built up a huge military machine. As Admiral Radford recently put it: "From the military viewpoint, the really spectacular aspect of Communist strength is its combination of a vast land area, a huge supply of people, and very large armed forces."

The Communist bloc today has at least six and one-half million men in its ground forces. The Soviets claim to have cut their ground forces recently by over one million men; but if they have done so, they are probably adding any money saved to weapons development. The Soviets have a large air force with modern planes. They are building up-to-date, long-range submarines. They are hard at work on guided missiles. We must assume that they have a considerable stockpile of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Communists are busily developing their military strength and efficiency, particularly in border areas and the area facing Taiwan.

This formidable military strength in the hands of the Communists raises some very basic questions. How great is the threat of a surprise atomic attack by the Communists? Is the threat of a nuclear war reduced by the Communists' knowledge that their aggressive use of armed force would bring down upon them quick and devastating retaliation? Is the danger of local aggression or so-called "brush warfare" greater than in the past? Do modern weapons reduce the need for large standing armies and conventional forces? Are foreign bases less essential in this day of guided missiles and long-range bombers?

There are no simple answers to these questions. They are the kind of politico-military problem with which we must wrestle. The American people must also seek to understand the basic elements of these problems. I am sure that General Pate and General LeMay gave you some very illuminating views on them when they spoke here at the Greater Issues Course.

Estimates of the military strength and intentions of the Communist nations are an essential part of the process of making national security policy. Only in this way can we devise realistic policies for the defense of our nation and the free-world coalition.

We must also examine the forces at work inside the Soviet Union, for these forces will affect the military capability and intentions of the Communist bloc. There is little reason to conclude that the basic features of the Soviet system are being changed. It remains a dictatorship based on an ideology hostile to the United States and to democratic methods. It has shown no intention of abandoning methods of force and subversion to attain its ends, even though it has in the 4 years since Stalin's death shown new flexibility and range in its methods and areas of operation. It continues to press for the development of heavy industry, for economic power rather than popular welfare.

The Soviet Dilemma

Nevertheless the Soviet rulers face a dilemma—they are still beset by the problem of how to operate the Soviet system without Stalin. This dilemma was made clear just a little over a year ago when Khrushchev last February made his famous secret speech to the Party congress in Moscow attacking Stalin.

Khrushchev and his fellow dictators had, upon the death of Stalin, initiated a policy designed to reduce tensions. Their motive was almost certainly their assessment that Stalin's methods at home and abroad had become too costly, too counterproductive, and if relentlessly pursued might entail unnecessary risks. They sought to lessen repression at home and in their foreign policies to put a big glove around the mailed fist. The denunciation of Stalin was a part of this process.

But once they lessened the atmosphere of fear at home and in the satellite countries, they found that the process was going too fast and was in danger of getting out of hand. Trends toward individual freedom and tolerance are not easily reversed. They face more ferment among intellectuals and students within the Soviet Union today than perhaps at any time in the postwar period. But that does not mean that the walls of the Kremlin are tumbling down.

In Poland rumblings which became audible at Poznań in June have settled at least temporarily for the nationally minded Gomulka regime, which has demonstrated surprising independence in some of its actions. In Hungary popular pressures erupted last October into the fierce national re-

volt that exposed the shallowness of Communist roots and smashed Moscow's myth of the irresistible attraction of the ideas of communism.

There can be no question that the Soviet rulers by their own actions have caused setbacks to their policies and precipitated new problems whose final dimensions are unpredictable. The Soviet system is undergoing new and marked strains. Its economic levels are well below what had been planned. It may be comforting to read these strains as symptomatic of communism's basic unworkability. Yet it would be dangerously misleading to see in the present troubles of the Communist bloc any major paralysis of Soviet power or any immediate lessening of the Soviet threat.

The Soviets have sought to cut their losses in Europe by stepping up their efforts to penetrate the Middle East and South Asia. They are willing practically to give away arms. Their technicians have moved into several countries. They have extended on easy terms almost one billion dollars of credits for economic purposes. The Soviets have found some countries receptive to their overtures.

President Eisenhower, in his special address to the Congress 2 months ago, set out certain broad elements of American policy toward the Middle East.² He asked the Congress to provide an American assurance that the Middle East would be protected against the threat of aggressive action by the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement. And he proposed that Congress make available the means for cooperative action between the United States and the Middle Eastern states to develop and strengthen in peace and freedom. Former Representative James Richards, another distinguished citizen of South Carolina and one who has just turned diplomat, will leave next week on a mission to various African and Asian countries as the President's special representative, to see how the legislation enacted by Congress can best be put into effect.

Our action will, we hope, provide an umbrella shielding the Middle Eastern countries from unfriendly interference from abroad. One of the basic forces for instability and danger will thus be neutralized.

Patient and careful diplomacy has already achieved important results in bringing about the

² BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1957, p. 83.

withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip. This step is a good omen for the future.

The Threat in the Far East

In the Far East the shape of the Communist threat is all too clear. Red China continues to gather its strength under Peiping's leadership, and its power has been firmly committed to the support of Moscow's efforts in repressing domestic and satellite dissidence, in launching new programs to disrupt free-world harmony, and in dealing with such problems as those in the Middle East.

Chinese Communist support of the Soviet Union, as the leader of the Communist camp, has been made unmistakable. In a series of statements and a joint declaration signed on January 18 the two major Communist powers have sought to define relations within the bloc. Primary emphasis has been placed on the importance of bloc solidarity.

Every Soviet move and threat has its Chinese counterpart. Chou En-lai toured Asia to mobilize support for the Soviet Union's disruptive policies in the Middle East and to encourage intransigent elements which might frustrate constructive resolutions of problems in that area. In foreign affairs every Soviet proposal and action finds Chinese endorsement.

Enjoying Soviet backing, Peiping continues to pursue its objectives in Asia. While its military power is felt in Korea, Viet-Nam, Taiwan, and along the Burma border, it has turned increasingly to a flexible use of political, economic, and cultural inducements to extend its influence among its neighbors. Because they often appear disarming, these methods are sometimes harder to deal with than the overt use of force. There is no slackening of the Communist threat on the Asian boundaries of the Sino-Soviet orbit.

Collective Security

It is a supreme irony of our history that, at the time when we are stronger than ever before, we are also more vulnerable. We are faced by a hostile and increasingly powerful Soviet bloc. Our historic bulwarks of time and space have been breached. No longer can we rely on time to mobilize our strength after war has begun some place else. And no longer are we secure in continental space behind ocean moats.

To meet the threat of international communism one of the major factors in our thinking has been the close cooperation and association with other governments in the free world for the establishment of a great and complicated system of collective security. The United States today has security arrangements with 42 countries. In the North Atlantic the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, and Iceland are joined with 11 European countries from Norway in the north to Greece and Turkey in the south—partners in the great North Atlantic Treaty Organization. On this continent the United States and 20 Latin American Republics are banded together under the Rio Pact. And in the Pacific the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and New Zealand have joined with the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand to create SEATO; Secretary Dulles is now on his way to attend a SEATO Council meeting. In addition, we have security treaties with the Philippines, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of China. In the Middle East we have a close interest in the Baghdad Pact, consisting of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom.

Inherent in this collective security system is the need for economic and military cooperation. Thus our foreign aid program has become a pillar of our foreign policy which may continue for the foreseeable future. This is of course supplemented by an important information and cultural program designed to spread understanding of our country and its policies. These resources—economic, military, and spiritual—are essential components of our total national strength. They give to our diplomatic efforts substance and meaning.

It is a time for wise leadership and steady nerves, for clarity of purpose and economy of means, for unswerving determination and flexibility in procedures. The enormity of modern weapons makes the thought of war repugnant, but a refusal to run any risk would amount to giving the Soviets a blank check. We can resolve our dilemma only by creating other alternatives both in our diplomacy and in our military policy. Such measures require stern resolution. They also require a full knowledge of the world situation and a finely balanced use of the resources at our command.

There is another thing that should be said about foreign policy, and that is that in the world of

today it isn't always possible for any one nation always to have its own way. As is the case in many domestic problems, compromise is frequently necessary. It is not always possible to have a perfect solution. Sometimes the perfect is the enemy of the good. Thus when we work in an organization like the United Nations, which includes a membership of 80 nations and where conflict of interest is frequently the rule, a solution of a given problem which seems perhaps logical and theoretically right may be practically impossible. The application of the principle of equal justice for all nations, large as well as small, is easy in the saying but more difficult in the achievement. We do not live in a world of fiat, but one where the resolution of conflicts of interest requires ingenuity and tolerance.

I would like to appeal to the group of cadets making up the student body of this great institution to take an active interest in the foreign policy of this country. I know that the demands made by your essential daily activities on your time and energies are great; but wherever it may be possible for you to devote some thought to foreign policy matters, it will be rewarding to you in your careers and it is important from the national-security point of view. I am sure that the Greater Issues Course is helping you understand these problems better.

Representatives of American Presidents Prepare for Final Meeting

Press release 108 dated March 4

The four subcommittees of the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives (IACPR) on March 4 commenced holding meetings in preparation of the final meeting of the Committee, which is scheduled to convene on April 29, 1957. The secretariat of the Committee is located in the Department of State.

The purpose of the subcommittees is to make a preliminary review of projects which may be submitted by the various representatives up to

March 15 under items included on the agenda approved by the IACPR on January 29. The recommendations of the subcommittees will be considered by the full Committee in drafting its final report. Meetings of the subcommittees are informal and not open to the public.

The Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives was formed as a result of the proposal of President Eisenhower at the Panama Meeting of American Presidents in July 1956.¹ The Committee has held two previous meetings in Washington, the first on September 17-19, 1956, and the second on January 28-29, 1957.² The IACPR is composed of personal representatives of each of the 21 Presidents of the American Republics, and it was created for the purpose of drawing up recommendations for strengthening the Organization of American States through increased activities in the economic, social, financial, technical, and atomic energy fields. The representative of the President of the United States is Milton S. Eisenhower, president of The Johns Hopkins University.

At its meeting in January 1957, the IACPR established an interim committee and four subcommittees to study the various proposals which will be considered at the next meeting of the Committee. The four subcommittees and the items assigned to them are as follows:

Subcommittee I—Foreign Trade, Private Investment, and Public Financing. Chairman: Ambassador Manuel Tello, representative of the President of Mexico.

Subcommittee II—Nuclear Energy. Chairman: Ambassador Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, representative of the President of Nicaragua.

Subcommittee III—Health, Agriculture, Industrialization, Trade Statistics, and Inter-American Highway Systems. Chairman: Ambassador César González, representative of the President of Venezuela.

Subcommittee IV—Education, Technical Cooperation, Housing, Public Information, and Social Welfare. Chairman: Ambassador Adolfo A. Vicchi, representative of the President of Argentina.

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 6, 1956, p. 219.

² For text of communique issued following the first session, see *ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1956, p. 513.

Congress Passes Joint Resolution on Middle East

Following is the text of a statement made by President Eisenhower on March 9 on the occasion of his signing of House Joint Resolution 117, as amended, together with a statement made by Secretary Dulles at the time the resolution was passed by the Senate and an announcement of plans for a trip to the Middle East by James P. Richards, Special Assistant to the President.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, MARCH 9

White House press release dated March 9

This occasion marks an important forward step in the development of friendly relations between the United States and the Middle East area. The joint resolution of the Congress which I have just signed expresses the determination of the legislative and executive branches of the Government to assist the nations in the general area of the Middle East to maintain their independence. It is a further demonstration of the will of the American people to preserve peace and freedom in the world.

The provisions of the resolution and, even more, the unity of national purpose which it reflects will increase the administration's capabilities to contribute to reducing the Communist danger in the Middle East and to strengthening the general stability of the area.

In my message to the Congress proposing the joint resolution now adopted¹ I said that I would send a special mission to the Middle East to explain the purposes of the resolution to the Middle Eastern countries, and to report to me on the most effective ways of carrying out these purposes. As

¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1957, p. 83. For a statement by Secretary Dulles and the text of the proposed resolution, see *ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1957, p. 126.

was announced on January 7, 1957,² the Honorable James P. Richards, former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has agreed to undertake this mission. Ambassador Richards will depart for the Middle East on March 12th.

I regard Ambassador Richards' mission as an essential and important first step in carrying out the policies set forth in the joint resolution. As those policies are based on the concept of cooperation, and as the assistance contemplated by the resolution will be extended only in response to requests from Middle Eastern governments, we must achieve the greatest possible measure of understanding and recognition of common interests with the area governments and their peoples. Ambassador Richards' mission is to advance this understanding and recognition of common interests. I know that he will bring to this task the integrity, ability, and sound judgment that have marked his long and distinguished career in public life.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES, MARCH 5

Press release 115 dated March 5

I am delighted that the Senate has now joined the House in passing the Middle East resolution by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. While further action will be necessary because of variations between the language of the House resolution and that adopted by the Senate, the substance is the same. It is now clear that the Congress of the United States has, by an impressive, nonpartisan majority, joined with the President to assure the peoples of the free nations in the Middle East that the United States stands ready to join with them to build up their strength and, if need be,

² *Ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1957, p. 130.

Joint Resolution To Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East ¹

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed \$200,000,000 from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That, whenever the President determines it to be important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority of section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (except that the provisions of section 105 (a) thereof shall not be waived), and without regard to the provisions of section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint

resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until fifteen days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, from which the funds are proposed to be derived: *Provided*, That funds available under this section during the balance of fiscal year 1957 shall, in the case of any such report submitted during the last fifteen days of the fiscal year, remain available for use under this section for the purposes stated in such report for a period of twenty days following the date of submission of such report. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The President should continue to furnish facilities and military assistance, within the provisions of applicable law and established policies, to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, with a view to maintaining the truce in that region.

SEC. 5. The President shall within the months of January and July of each year report to the Congress his action hereunder.

SEC. 6. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

¹ H. J. Res. 117, as amended. H. J. Res. 117 was passed by the House of Representatives on Jan. 30 by a vote of 355 to 61; H. J. Res. 117, as amended, was passed by the Senate on Mar. 5 (72 to 19); the House accepted the Senate version on Mar. 7 (350 to 60).

help them to defend their national integrity and independence against Communist armed aggression.

This is a major step and should contribute greatly to peace and security in the area. It opens the way to building up the strength of the area through providing security and strength for the independence of nations. It leaves no possibility of miscalculation by potential armed aggressors.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMBASSADOR RICHARDS' DEPARTURE

Press release 126 dated March 9

The President on March 9 signed House Joint Resolution 117, thus completing the enactment into law of his proposal for closer cooperation between the United States and those countries of the Middle East desiring such cooperation.

In consequence, Ambassador James P. Richards, whom the President appointed on January 7 as his Special Assistant to advise and assist him and the Secretary of State on problems of the Middle East area, plans to depart on March 12 for visits to Middle Eastern countries. He looks forward to discussions concerning the President's program with those governments which have indicated an interest.

Other members of Ambassador Richards' party are as follows:

Department of State

John D. Jernegan, Counselor of Embassy (with personal rank of Minister), Rome, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs

William C. Burdett, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs

Vernon Merrill, Escort Officer

International Cooperation Administration

Cedric Seager, Regional Director for the Near East and South Asia

Department of Defense

Capt. Ray M. Pitts, USN, Department of Defense Representative and Special Assistant to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

U.S. Information Agency

William B. King, Area Policy Officer

Mrs. Donna Jakobsson, Secretary

Maxine Wtorek, Secretary

The Ambassador and his party will travel in a special plane provided by the Department of Defense. They plan to proceed first to Beirut, Lebanon, and then to Tripoli and Tobruk, Libya, and to Ankara, Turkey. The remainder of the itinerary is being kept flexible to permit changes in timing and route if it develops during the trip that such changes are required. However, the party intends to visit all of the countries of the Middle East desiring such a visit.

Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5

Press release 111 dated March 5

Secretary Dulles: I have a brief statement, copies of which will be available to you as you leave the auditorium.¹

It is a matter of great gratification to the United States that the Government of Israel has decided to complete its withdrawal behind the armistice line in compliance with the United Nations resolution of February 2² and that a schedule for effectuating such withdrawal has been worked out with General Burns, the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force.

Once again it has been demonstrated that the free-world nations have a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as reflected in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

As President Eisenhower said in his letter to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of March 2, 1957,³

¹ The following three paragraphs were also released separately as press release 110 dated Mar. 5.

² For text, see BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1957, p. 327.

³ *Ibid.*, Mar. 18, 1957, p. 433.

the Israeli decision was not an easy one. We believe, however, that the decision will prove to have been a wise one from the standpoint not only of Israel but of all the nations concerned. It should, as President Eisenhower said, make it possible to bring about conditions in the area more stable, more tranquil, and more conducive to the general welfare than those which existed heretofore.

Now I am ready for questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been a general feeling, I think, that the truce withdrawal issue has been a sort of bar to the solution of a lot of problems in the Middle East. Now that the decision to withdraw has been made, how quickly do you think it might be possible to make a start on getting at least an interim solution in the Suez Canal problem?

A. Why, I should hope that that would move forward very rapidly, as quickly as Egypt is satisfied that the withdrawal is actually going to take place, and I think that the evidence of that will

be very quickly forthcoming. There has been, I think, a tendency on the part of Egypt to drag its feet on these matters, and I hope that that tendency will disappear. The canal ought to be opened very quickly now, and there ought to be an understanding as to how the tolls will be paid and for carrying out such principles as were laid down by the Security Council last October to govern the future operations in accordance with the treaty of 1888.

Q. Mr. Secretary, has the United States done anything to ask Egypt to relieve this foot dragging that you are talking about?

A. We have always shown an interest in that, of course, but the primary responsibility for action in this matter is with the Secretary-General.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what response have you had to the Western interim plan which was sent to the Secretary-General some time ago?

A. So far as we are aware, there has been no response. Whether the Secretary-General has any Egyptian views or not, I do not know. But, if so, he has not communicated them to the United States.

Q. There have been none from Egypt, as far as you know?

A. That is right.

Public Documents Setting Forth U.S. Position

Q. Mr. Secretary, there seems to be some question there about what commitments, if any, the United States has given Israel previous to this withdrawal. Could you expand on that for us, please?

A. Yes. The position of the United States with reference to these matters has been fully and totally set forth in the public documents in the case. Those are primarily the aide memoire of February 11,⁴ the President's speech of February 20,⁵ the statement of Ambassador Lodge on March 1,⁶ and the letter of the President to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, that I referred to, of March 2. There are no private assurances to anyone which go beyond or which are different from what is set forth in those public documents.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Mar. 11, 1957, p. 392.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 387.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Mar. 18, 1957, p. 431.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there were reports that several members of the SEATO [Southeast Asia Treaty Organization] will ask the United States to supply guided missiles for this area. Have you been given any indications that such a request will be forthcoming?

A. No. I am not aware of that. I have not as yet had a chance to study the agenda for the SEATO conference. I am leaving for that tomorrow, as perhaps you know, and my documentation is going to be on the plane. I am not yet quite fully versed as to what may come up there.

Q. Has "guided democracy" in Indonesia become a matter of concern to the SEATO nations, in your opinion, sir?

A. Well, Indonesia of course is a very important part of the Southeast Asia area. It is not in the treaty or covered by the treaty. It is not a part of the treaty area, but it is of course geographically in the Southeast Asia area. It lies between Indochina, which is covered in the treaty, and some of the other treaty areas, such as Australia and New Zealand, and what happens there is naturally of interest and concern to the members. The developments there are so far primarily of an internal character, apparently relating to the form of government and to the degree of autonomy of different parts of that rather farflung archipelago, and these developments are still in process of evolution; so, while it is a matter of interest and of concern, I don't think the concern is one which is tinged by any fear that the area will fall under Communist domination.

Q. Mr. Secretary, this past Friday Israel's Foreign Minister announced that her country would withdraw from Gaza and Aqaba under certain assumptions, such as that the withdrawal from Gaza would be made under the assumption that the U.N. troops exclusively would occupy that area. Is the United States sympathetic to the assumptions made by Mrs. Meir?

A. The statements were not quite as you put them. The statement about the takeover being exclusively by the United Nations Emergency Force related to the initial takeover and was stated by Mrs. Meir in precisely the language which was used by the Secretary-General in his report, and the balance of what Mrs. Meir said was stated primarily in terms of expectations and not necessarily of assumptions. The United States stated its

position on these matters, I think, quite fully and carefully in the statement which was made by Ambassador Lodge.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did you and have you and Foreign Minister von Brentano given any attention to the four-power working groups that are to begin on German unity here tomorrow, and, if not, what do you think that these four-power groups would be able to accomplish during their talks here?

A. Well, we have not in our talks gotten around to that yet. I expect that those matters will come up in our discussion this afternoon.

Q. Will you tell us, please, sir, how your talks with Von Brentano are going so far?

A. I think that they are going very well indeed. We seem to have a unity of viewpoint which is quite complete with respect to the matters which we have discussed so far.

Q. Mr. Secretary, some time ago the State Department asked Justice to take legal action against State laws which discriminate against Japanese textiles, that is, posting laws. Is such a suit going to be filed?

A. I am sorry I don't know the answer to that question. I wrote a letter to the Department of Justice requesting that action be taken, and I have not myself had any contact with the Department of Justice since then; so I just don't know whether or not they are proceeding in that direction. I assume that they are, but that is purely an assumption on my part.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there seems to be some concern in Hawaii about the possibility of damage or injury there from the British nuclear tests at Christmas Island. I have been asked to inquire whether the U.S. Government is satisfied itself that there is no such danger.

A. We are satisfied that there is no such danger. The character of the tests will be such and the explosion will take place at a height such that there is no danger of any fallout affecting Hawaii.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is it the U.S. position that UNEF should stay in Gaza until there is some definitive agreement on that area and that Egyptian authorities should not revert there? Is that not a correct statement of the U.S. position?

A. I am going to have to ask you to read Ambassador Lodge's speech, which expressed our po-

sition on that point. And if I should attempt to restate it by memory, I might inadvertently put it slightly differently. What I want to do is to stick just exactly to what Ambassador Lodge said, because that was a very carefully considered statement.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned Mr. Lodge's speech and some other documents as expressing the U.S. position on this question of Sinai troop withdrawals, and then you say that there are no private understandings. Would you say that these public documents represent promises or assurances or guaranties, or how would you describe them?

A. Well, for the most part, they are statements of what we believe the international law of the case is, and certainly, as regards the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, what we state there is a view which we have always held with respect to that being a passage to an international body of water, and it is, indeed, the same view which was expressed by the Egyptian Government in answer to an inquiry by the United States back—I think it was in 1950.⁷ And it is a restatement of our position, what we consider to be the international law of the case.

As regards the Gaza Strip, we stated in Ambassador Lodge's speech—we repeated in substance, and indeed verbatim—what the Secretary-General had previously said, which was covered by the second resolution of February 2⁸ calling for the implementation of the Secretary-General's report.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the President's letter to Ben-Gurion the President says he hopes that the expectations raised by the Israeli Prime Minister will not be proven in vain—more or less like that. Would you say that this includes that part of Mrs. Meir's speech where she expressed the hope that the Egyptian troops would not return to Gaza?

A. I do not think that the President's letter should be read as endorsing every detail of everything that was said. The President's letter referred to the fact that statements were made by the Foreign Minister of Israel and by others with relation to their hopes and expectations. The others included, of course, the statement made by

⁷ See also U.S. aide memoire of Feb. 11.

⁸ BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1957, p. 327.

Ambassador Lodge as well as the statement by Mrs. Meir, and there were other statements made there. The President's letter, I think, referred generally to the hopes and expectations for a better future for the area and should not be interpreted as necessarily an endorsement of every detail of everything that everybody said, because, indeed, some of those statements were in conflict with each other.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are you confident that the UNEF has adequate forces for even the immediate future?

A. Yes, I believe it has.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the Franco-American communique of last week,⁹ there is a reference to the common approach of the two Governments regarding the world problem. Can you elaborate on that? Does this mean that from now on the two Governments will have a more united, concerted diplomatic action with regard to the Middle Eastern problems?

A. Well, we certainly hope so. We don't like it when our views differ, and we hope that in the future we will be more in accord than we were, at one time at least, in the past. I don't think there is very much to add to that.

Question of Newsmen Going to Communist China

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you and Mr. Eisenhower discussed in the last month the question of American newsmen going to Red China?¹⁰ I believe the President said at his conference on February 5 that he would talk it over with you.

A. Yes, we have discussed it again.

Q. Is the administration's position now the same as it was a month ago, namely, a flat opposition to letting these people go to Red China?

A. Well, we have not altered the position which we then took. We are continuing to study and explore the matter to see whether any ways could be found to satisfy better the demand for news coverage without seeming to drop the barriers down generally and to permit of what the Chinese Communists call "cultural exchange." So far, we

have not found any solution, but, undoubtedly, we will keep on studying the matter.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that point is there any reason why the administration is unwilling to test in the courts of the United States its policy of denying the passports, the right of the Executive to deny passports?

A. Well, I suppose any citizen is entitled to take his case to court. We don't oppose that.

Q. What is the position of the State Department about those men who have gone in without passports? Do you intend to bring suit in that case in the courts or to take any action against those men?

A. Well, I don't think there is any plan to take legal action against them. A question could come up about the renewal of their passports.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that point I believe that Mr. Worthy's expired yesterday and that he has applied for renewal. What will be done in his case?

A. I can't tell you. I didn't know that he had applied for renewal.

Q. Yes, he did.

Resumption of U.S. Aid in Middle East

Q. Mr. Secretary, as soon as the withdrawal has been completed, does the United States intend to resume aid as well as other forms of assistance to both Israel and Egypt, and the other countries in the Middle East area?

A. Well, I would say there that, as soon as the conditions which led to the suspension have been altered and the situation is back again where it was, then we would go back again presumably to where we were.

Q. Does not that withdrawal—doesn't that fulfill the conditions? I presume now you are referring to the reopening of the Suez Canal as being the other condition?

A. That has a bearing on it also.

Q. If those two conditions are fulfilled, would those complete the conditions, or are there still others?

A. You have got a whole series of questions: the reopening of the canal, the conditions under which it is reopened, the future status of the canal,

⁹ *Ibid.*, Mar. 18, 1957, p. 438.

¹⁰ For background, see *ibid.*, Aug. 20, 1956, p. 313, and Jan. 14, 1957, p. 54.

the treatment of American business people in the area—there are a number of problems which still remain to be resolved.

Q. In other words, you don't expect this resumption to take place in the immediate future?

A. Well, are you referring to the whole area or—

Q. The resumption of aid specifically to Israel, as well as the unfreezing of funds, and perhaps the resumption of aid to Egypt.

A. Well, there will be nothing automatic about any of those matters, and probably each country will be dealt with on a country-by-country basis.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could I restate that question, because I am a little confused on the answer?

A. Yes.

Q. Aid personnel was withdrawn from four countries, as I remember. Taking that as a problem by itself, is there a prospect now with the lessening of the danger of hostilities, which was the reason for withdrawal—the prospect now of the early return of the aid personnel to these four countries?

A. Well, I don't think that you can deal with all of the countries as a bloc. Each country has to be dealt with on its own basis. We would not withhold a resumption of technical aid, for example, to one country because the conditions in a third country were such that we felt it was either contrary to policy or contrary to security considerations to have the people go back.

Reopening of Suez Canal

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the issue of reopening the canal, since the Egyptians have indicated, indirectly at least, that they intend not to let the British and French ships go through until there is some settlement of their claims over the war, has this country yet got a policy to stand with Britain and France on our shipping going through or not going through the canal until the British and the French and all other nations are allowed to go through?

A. I understand your question is whether we would hold our ships back unless it is open to all ships.

Q. Yes.

A. We have no such policy, no. I would like

to supplement that by saying that the United States has no reason to believe that there will be the discrimination against British and French shipping which your question presupposes.

Q. Mr. Secretary, recently the Prime Minister of Japan resigned because of illness and was replaced by Prime Minister Kishi. Do you have any comment about the replacement of the Prime Minister with Mr. Kishi? And do you expect the new Prime Minister to come to the United States?

A. That visit is being considered. There has been no formal invitation as yet.

Q. And I wonder whether you have any idea how soon the canal may be opened.

A. Well, I believe that it could be opened probably, if the work goes forward vigorously, in about 10 days.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the question of the return of the 199 foreign-aid technicians from that particular area of hostilities, they were withdrawn because, as I remember, the bombs were falling. Now that that situation has been done away with, will those people be going back into their Middle East posts?

A. The answer to that question I think is given in the reply which I previously made, which is that we do not deal just with the area as a whole; we deal with it on a country-by-country basis. And if the reasons for the withdrawal seem to have disappeared, then they will go back.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would you say that this is the case of Israel?

A. Well, I would believe that after the troops and the other forces are withdrawn behind the armistice lines, and if it then seems that there will be a period of tranquillity and that the danger of military outbreaks has subsided, then the situation would go back to what it was before.

International Character of Straits of Tiran

Q. Mr. Secretary, our policy and the British and French policy regarding the international character of the Straits of Tiran are in conflict with the statements of India and several Arab nations and now the later statement from Egypt that they consider them national waters—we are at variance on that. What is the step? How do you settle this?

A. Well, I wouldn't quickly jump to the conclusion that our views are indeed at variance. This is a highly complicated question of international law, and the use of words has to be very precise. It is true in one sense of the word that the Straits of Tiran are territorial, because the straits are less than 6 miles wide and the generally accepted zone of territorial control is 3 miles. So in that sense they are territorial waters. But it is also a principle of international law that, even though waters are territorial, if they give access to a body of water which comprehends international waterways, there is a right of free and innocent passage. And some of the statements which have been made unofficially by Egypt, from Egyptian sources at least, contain statements which we would entirely agree with in the sense that the straits, as I say, are less than 6 miles wide and therefore comprehended within the 3-mile limit, measuring it from both sides. That doesn't determine the question as to whether or not there is the right to passage. Now, you asked a further question—how it would be resolved. In our aide memoire we stated that we would abide by any decision by the International Court of Justice.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is your statement that you just made then not open to the inference that there are two ways of looking at this, and that the Egyptians would be entirely justified in blocking the passage and submitting the thing to the Court and keeping it closed until the Court settled it some years later?

A. Well, the United States view is that the passage should be opened unless there is a contrary decision by the International Court of Justice. That was the viewpoint expressed in our aide memoire of February 11. I might also add that that is the point of view which is reflected in the Secretary-General's report, in which he says that in view of the history of this matter, and the prior positions, that it is not a situation where it is believed that Egypt should exercise belligerent rights.

Q. In short, it would take a decision, in your view, of the Court to close it, rather than a decision of the Court to open it?

A. That's right.

Q. You said in the memorandum that the United States Government expected to exercise its right

of free and innocent passage through this strait into the Gulf of Aqaba. Have you taken any steps or do you contemplate taking any step to establish this exercise of right on the part of the United States—in other words, should a ship or ships normally begin to move through there now? Have they already moved?

A. Well, there is no prearranged exercise in that respect. It would be normal that a ship of United States registry would be going through there. You see, it is only quite recently that the port of Elath has been developed so that it is a port which attracts shipping. Now there has been a development of the port of Elath to a point where there will probably be considerable shipping going there, and in the normal course of events that would include a vessel of United States registry.

Q. But you don't know of any particular ship?

A. No, I haven't looked into that. Of course, that is a matter which is primarily under private direction. The shipping companies send their ships where they will. We assume that one will be going there, but that is not based upon any checkup with the companies.

Q. I wondered, sir, whether it would be normal procedure for the United States Government to send notice to the shipping companies that the strait is considered to be open, or whether everybody is supposed to know it?

A. Well, I think that everybody is supposed to have read the newspapers in that respect, particularly if they are in the shipping business.

Q. What are the prospects, Mr. Secretary, on resumption of our negotiations with the Philippines on military bases? They broke down 3 months ago, I believe.

A. I believe that some consideration is being given to a possible resumption. But that matter is primarily at the moment in the hands of the Defense Department.

U.N. Emergency Force

Q. Mr. Secretary, on Friday [March 1], India said in the United Nations that it would have to dissociate itself from the idea that UNEF could go into Gaza and take over the civil administration, and both the Yugoslavs and the Indians have

indicated that, if Egypt objected, they would withdraw from the Force. How long do you think that they can keep the United Nations Force in Gaza without another United Nations resolution?

A. Well, I believe the matter is adequately covered by the second resolution of the 2d of February. I don't think another resolution is required. Of course, the United Nations cannot require countries to keep their elements in the UNEF. And I suppose to some extent UNEF could be disrupted by withdrawals. But I do not anticipate that will take place.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said a few minutes ago that we assume that British and French shipping will go through the canal without discrimination. Do we have any similar assumption connected with Israeli ships?

A. I think it was indicated in one of the statements I referred to—I think it was the President's speech of February 20—that we should not assume that there will be a discrimination against Israeli ships.

Q. Mr. Secretary, after the last Israeli soldier leaves Egypt, will we recognize Egypt's right to reassert the state of belligerency on which she has blocked Israel, or will we consider her then in violation of the treaty of 1888 and the Security Council and act accordingly?

A. Well, we are not indulging in any assumptions or speculations that there will be a violation of the 1888 treaty, if that is what your question assumed.

Q. No, my question assumes that Egypt has insisted on a state of belligerency between itself and the State of Israel. Well, if this insistence continues, how will we regard that?

A. I prefer not to answer that question.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when do you expect the last Israeli troops to be out of Egypt?

A. I think the information on that respect is regarded as classified, and I don't think I can answer it. I'm informed as to the prospective schedule, but I'm not at liberty to make it public. I think it is a reasonably expeditious schedule.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the question of newspapermen going to Red China, you said the President and you are still discussing the problem of drop-

ping the news barriers. Did you mean ordinary barriers to travel to Red China? Is that what you had in mind?

A. One of the problems we face here is the fact that there is a general drive by Communist China to reestablish what it calls cultural intercourse with other countries, and it is particularly pressing that on countries which are neighbors, the free countries, and where such relationship could not, I think, be reestablished without danger to those countries. And one of our problems is not to set an example which would be bearable by us but which, if it was extended generally, would have perhaps dangerous repercussions in other areas.

Q. Well, there have been recommendations that the State Department announce that any reporters going to Red China do so at their own risk and that they would thereby be permitted to go. Has any thought been given to this possibility of solving the problem?

A. Yes, I think we have given thought to all possibilities. Let me say this, it is a general principle of international law that no individual can waive the responsibility of a government to look out for its own citizens. There is also a problem as to whether or not it is possible to allow certain persons to go and other persons not to go. There are people who feel that their mission to go into all the world is just as commanding as that which impels the newspaper people. It's an extremely complicated subject.

Q. Mr. Secretary, news reports from Cairo say that President Nasser has stated he feels that Egypt is no longer bound by the six-point United Nations agreement¹¹ because of the acts of France, Israel, and England. And that agreement says that the Suez would be open to ships of all nations. Would you care to comment on that?

A. Well, I think our comment on it is found in the communique which was issued here jointly with the French Prime Minister a few days ago, where we reaffirmed our belief in the six principles.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did you discuss with King Saud who was going to occupy the islands of the straits when the Israelis move out?

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Oct. 22, 1956, p. 616.

A. No. The occupancy was arranged between Saudi Arabia and Egypt back in 1950, when Saudi Arabia consented to their occupation by Egypt, and we have no reason to believe that that arrangement will be altered. We did not discuss it with King Saud.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did the question of Poland play a large part in your discussions yesterday with Von Brentano?

A. Well, we discussed the question of the satellites, Poland and Hungary and East Germany and so forth.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would you be able to amplify your early comment that Egypt seemed to be dragging its feet on making arrangements about the Suez Canal—what form this takes?

A. There have been grounds to suggest that Egypt did not want to make progress, in relation to the Suez Canal matter, until there was assurance that the Israeli troops would be withdrawn. That has not been an officially expressed position, but reading between the lines we could gather that that was perhaps the actual position. There have been still two sunken ships, as you know, which still block the Suez Canal, which supposedly contain explosives which the Egyptian Government says it wants to take the responsibility of removing but which it has not yet removed. Various things of that sort lead us to believe that the Egyptians have not wanted to hurry on the matter of the canal until they are quite sure the Israelis would get out. We hope that that situation will now change.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Harold Connolly, the United States Olympic hammer-throw champion, is reported that way about a Czech lady discus thrower. (Laughter) And he has appealed to the Czech Government for permission to get her out and marry her—bring her to this country. Is the United States Government making any appeals to back up his appeal?

A. Well, we believe in romance. (Laughter)

Q. Are you doing anything to implement this case?

A. I can't answer for that particular case, but our basic principle is as I stated it.

March 25, 1957

419485-57-3

New State of Ghana

ANNOUNCEMENT OF U.S. RECOGNITION

Press release 113 dated March 5

The U.S. Government has officially recognized the new state of Ghana, which becomes independent and a member of the British Commonwealth on March 6.

With the permission of the Government of Ghana, the American consulate general at Accra will be raised to the status of an embassy at 1 minute past midnight on March 6. At that time, Donald W. Lamm, consul general, will be named chargé d'affaires pending the appointment of an ambassador to Ghana.

The U.S. Government has also informed the Government of Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah that it would welcome the establishment of a Ghanaian embassy at Washington as soon as practicable.

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF GHANA

White House press release dated March 6

On behalf of the people of the United States of America, I wish to extend to the Government and people of Ghana, congratulations on the occasion of your joining the family of independent nations. We have watched with particular admiration the manner in which you have attained your independence, for it shows the good fruit of statesman-like cooperative effort between the Government and people of Ghana and the Government and people of the United Kingdom. I am sure that this same spirit will characterize Ghana's relationship with the Free World, including the great and voluntary association of nations, the British Commonwealth.

In extending these good wishes, I speak for a people that cherishes independence, which we deeply believe is the right of all peoples who are able to discharge its responsibilities. It is with special pleasure, therefore, that we witness the establishment of your new nation and the assumption of its sovereign place in the Free World.

In sending you these greetings, I am conscious of the many years of friendship which have characterized the relations between our two countries.

We are proud that some of your distinguished leaders have been educated in the United States. We are also proud that many of our most accomplished citizens had their ancestry in your country. We are pleased that trade between our two countries has developed to the benefit of both countries. But most importantly, we revere in common with you the great and eternal principles which characterize the free democratic way of life. I am confident that our two countries will stand as one in safeguarding this greatest of all bonds between us.

Ghana Becomes 81st Member of United Nations

*Statement by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹*

The United States will vote here in the General Assembly for the admission of Ghana to the United Nations as we did in the Security Council. We look forward to friendly relations at the United Nations with the representatives of Ghana.

The United States sees in Ghana a peace-loving state which accepts the obligations of the charter and is able and willing to carry them out. We were happy that this opinion was shared unanimously in the Security Council yesterday. Today's vote, I am sure, will confirm overwhelmingly the Security Council's judgment.

In the Security Council yesterday I had the pleasure of paying tribute to the wise policy of the United Kingdom which has led to Ghana's independence and to the happy relationship which exists today between the United Kingdom and Ghana. Let me again pay tribute to this example of British statesmanship.

Ghana's independence is also of special interest to Americans: The ancestors of many of our fellow Americans came from there; many Americans, of whom I was one, visited Accra during the war; Prime Minister Nkrumah studied here in the United States; and the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, headed a delegation of distinguished Americans to be present at Ghana's independence day.

¹ Made in plenary session on Mar. 8 (U.S. delegation press release 2639).

Ghana joins the United Nations at a momentous time in the history of this organization. The responsibilities which this new state assumes by its membership are heavy. But the weight of responsibility is overshadowed by the opportunities which United Nations membership offers for constructive efforts to prevent war, to harmonize international relations, and to cooperate in solving problems of an economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character.

The United States welcomes the opportunity to cooperate fully with Ghana in these United Nations efforts. We extend to the people and Government of Ghana—and to Ghana's associates in the Commonwealth—our sincere congratulations and best wishes.²

German Foreign Minister Visits United States

Following is the text of a joint communique issued at the close of a meeting between Secretary Dulles and Heinrich von Brentano, Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, at Washington on March 5. The German Foreign Minister made an official visit to Washington from March 3 to 7.

Press release 114 dated March 5

Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano of the Federal Republic of Germany and Secretary of State Dulles today concluded the official talks which they have held during the Foreign Minister's current visit to Washington.

These talks covered a broad range of current world problems of mutual concern to both governments and afforded an opportunity for a full and frank exchange of views. Particular attention was devoted to an assessment of the general political situation in the light of recent developments in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. The talks have served to emphasize and reinforce the community of interest and the harmony of views which exist between the two governments with regard to the problems confronting them.

The Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State reaffirmed that the reunification of Germany

² On Mar. 8 the General Assembly unanimously approved the application of Ghana for membership in the United Nations.

in freedom remains a fundamental objective of the policies of their governments. They were in agreement that recent developments in Eastern Europe have served to emphasize the urgent necessity for a solution of the problem of German reunification in the absence of which there can be no permanent settlement in Europe or any lasting stability. They expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would come to realize that it is in its own interest that there be a just solution of this problem. They noted that a study of the problem of German reunification and its relationship to European security is being undertaken in Washington by experts of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic. This study should provide a common basis for dealing with any new developments which might have a bearing on these questions.

The Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State were also in complete agreement that recent developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have afforded no basis to the West for lowering its guard.

They shared the view that the maintenance of the strength of NATO remains as important as ever. Foreign Minister von Brentano stressed in this regard the determination of the Federal German Government to proceed as rapidly as possible with building up its own military strength in order to be able to make its agreed contribution to the Western collective defense system.

The Foreign Minister informed the Secretary of the progress being made towards the signing of treaties for the creation of a European Common Market and the establishment of a European organization with common authority and responsibility in the field of atomic energy (EURATOM).¹ The Foreign Minister and the Secretary were in agreement that early approval and implementation of these treaties would contribute materially to enhancing the close association between Europe and the United States.

The Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State reviewed current problems in the Middle East. They were in agreement as to the urgent need for a peaceful solution of these problems in conformity with the principles of justice and interna-

tional law. The Secretary of State welcomed the Foreign Minister's indication of the desire of the Federal German Government to contribute in whatever ways might be appropriate to reaching a just and lasting settlement of the problems of the area.

The Foreign Minister will call on President Eisenhower in the White House on Thursday morning, March 7.

Working Group on Germany and European Security

Press release 118 dated March 6

The first meeting of a Four-Power Working Group was held at Washington on March 6.

The group is reviewing the problem of the reunification of Germany in relation to European security on the basis of the proposals made at the Geneva meeting of Foreign Ministers of 1955 and in the light of subsequent developments. This review is being initially undertaken by a working party established by the Federal Republic and the three Western powers in view of the special responsibility of the latter with regard to questions relating to Germany as a whole. Upon the conclusion of its study, the report of the group will be submitted to the four Governments. Subsequently the matter will be considered in the North Atlantic Council.

The chief representatives on the working group are Jean Leonard Laloy, Director of the European Section of the French Foreign Office; Wilhelm Grewe, Director of the Political Division of the German Foreign Office; Patrick Francis Hancock, Director of the Western Division of the British Foreign Office; and Jacob Beam, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

Eximbank Credit to Austria

The Export-Import Bank of Washington announced on March 5 an \$8 million credit to finance export purchases of cotton in the United States by three Austrian banks. The loan is repayable 18 months from the date of drafts, and the credit will be available for a period of 1 year. Austrian spinners are expected to buy, through the borrowing banks, supplies of long-staple, high-grade U.S. cotton.

¹ For background on the European common market and EURATOM, see BULLETIN of Feb. 4, 1957, p. 182, and Feb. 25, 1957, p. 306.

U.S. and U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945

H. Doc. 111, 85th Congress, 1st Session

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States:

I send you herewith an amendment to the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1945¹ signed for the United States by the Secretary of the Treasury and for the United Kingdom by the British Ambassador. Your approval is recommended and requested.

Under the terms of the 1945 agreement, the United Kingdom is entitled to waiver, that is, cancellation, of interest payments under certain rather elaborately defined conditions. Over the years, and with changing circumstances, it has become practically impossible to apply this important feature of the agreement.

This last December, the British claimed a waiver of the interest for 1956 and set the sum involved aside pending consultation. Up to that time, they had made in full every payment of principal and interest called for by the agreement.

The amendment gives the United Kingdom a right to postpone not more than seven annual installments of principal and interest when it finds such action necessary in view of present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of the United Kingdom's gold and foreign exchange reserves. In addition, the 1956 installment of interest would be postponed. In exchange for this, the United Kingdom forgoes any right to claim a waiver or cancellation of interest payments and agrees to pay interest annually on the full amount of all postponed installments.

The amendment to the agreement is a common-sense solution which attempts to carry out the spirit of the agreement in a way that is practical and fair to both parties.

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation approving the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in signing the amendatory agreement on behalf of the United States.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 6, 1957.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

AGREEMENT TO AMEND THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT OF DECEMBER 6, 1945, BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3 hereof, it is hereby agreed between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as follows with regard to the Financial Agreement executed by them on December 6, 1945:

1. Section 5 is amended to read:

5. *Deferment of annual installments.*

(i) In any calendar year after December 31, 1956, in which the Government of the United Kingdom advises the Government of the United States that it finds that a deferment is necessary in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves, the Government of the United Kingdom may defer the payment of the annual installment for that year of principal repayment and interest specified under Section 4. Not more than seven (7) annual installments may be so deferred. The first of any such deferred installments shall be paid on December 31, 2001, and the others shall be paid annually thereafter, in order.

(ii) In addition, the installment of interest in respect of the year 1956 is hereby deferred, in lieu of any right of waiver hitherto existing. This installment shall be paid on December 31 of the year following that in which the last of all other installments, including installments deferred under the preceding paragraph, is due.

(iii) Deferred installments shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum, payable annually on December 31 of each year following that in which deferment occurs.

(iv) Payment of deferred installments may be accelerated, in whole or in part, at the option of the Government of the United Kingdom.

2. Section 6 is amended to read:

6. *Relation of this line of credit to other obligations.* The Government of the United Kingdom undertakes not to defer an installment under Section 5 of this Agreement in any year, unless it also defers the installment due in that year under the Financial Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom, dated March 6, 1946.

3. This Agreement shall become effective when the Government of the United States has notified the Government of the United Kingdom that the Agreement has been approved by the Congress and the Government of the United Kingdom has notified the Government of the United

¹ 60 Stat. 1841; Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1545; also printed in BULLETIN of Dec. 9, 1945, p. 907.

States that the appropriate Parliamentary action has been taken.

Signed in duplicate this 6th day of March, 1957.
For the Government of the United States of America:

G. M. HUMPHREY

*Secretary of the Treasury of the
United States of America*

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

HAROLD CACCIA

Her Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington

U.S. Delegation Leaves To Attend Third Meeting of SEATO Council

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 102 dated March 1

Secretary Dulles will attend the third meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to be held at Canberra March 11-13. This is the annual meeting of the Foreign Ministers of member countries at which the accomplishments of the year are reviewed and plans approved for future activities and development of the organization. Secretary Dulles participated in the two previous meetings held at Bangkok and Karachi, as well as in the negotiation of the treaty at Manila which brought SEATO into being. The Secretary will return directly to the United States immediately following the meeting in order to accompany the President to Bermuda.

Just prior to the Council meeting, on March 8 and 9, the SEATO Military Advisers will meet at Canberra. The U.S. representative at this meeting will be Adm. Felix B. Stump, USN, Commander in Chief, Pacific and U.S. Pacific Fleet, who is the U.S. military adviser for SEATO.

The complete U.S. delegation to the SEATO Council of Ministers meeting at Canberra is as follows:

U.S. Representative

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State

Special Assistant

John W. Hanes, Jr.

March 25, 1957

Coordinator

G. Frederick Reinhardt, Department of State

Deputy Coordinator

George M. Abbott, Special Assistant for SEATO Affairs, Department of State.

Senior Advisers

Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State
Adm. Felix B. Stump, USN, Commander in Chief, Pacific and U.S. Pacific Fleet

Avery F. Peterson, Chargé d'Affaires, Canberra, Australia
Max W. Bishop, U.S. Council Representative and Ambassador to Thailand

Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs (Designate)

Raymond T. Moyer, Regional Director for Far East, International Cooperation Administration

Charles A. Sullivan, Director, Office of Special International Affairs, Department of Defense

Advisers

John C. Ausland

John S. Farrington

John L. Hart

Robert A. Hewitt, Brigadier General, USA

John C. Hill

Robert E. Hoey

Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.

Lemuel M. Stevens, Captain, USN

William V. Turnage

C. Dudley Withers

Robert W. Zimmermann

Secretariat

Joseph N. Greene, Jr.

Robert L. Burns

Special Assistant to Coordinator

J. Stewart Cottman

Secretary

Bruce Grainger

SECRETARY DULLES' DEPARTURE STATEMENT, MARCH 6

Press release 117 dated March 6

I go to Australia to take part in the meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).

Though SEATO is little more than 2 years old, this will be my fourth visit to the Far East in connection with its creation and development. There was first the negotiation of the treaty in Manila. Then there came the first and second meetings of the SEATO Council held in Thailand and in Pakistan.

In this 2½ years SEATO has become firmly established and has made a positive contribution to peace and stability in Asia. The Organization is an outstanding example of successful cooperation among eight nations, both eastern and western. It brings security in the face of Communist threats. By so doing, it encourages constructive achievements in political, economic, and cultural fields. SEATO will be further developed at this third Council meeting. The United States is deeply interested in this, for we are a Pacific power as well as an Atlantic power.

I welcome the opportunity to visit Australia once again. I have had long and cordial relations with its leaders. Also I had an earlier enjoyable and useful visit there in 1951 when I negotiated the tripartite security agreement between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States—the organization known as ANZUS.

ANZUS and SEATO reinforce each other in many ways. Both are defensive pacts; both have played an important part in bringing to the Pacific and Southeast Asian areas the comparative peace and security they now enjoy; both have been established within the framework of the United Nations. These pacts are necessary to make clear to aggressive nations the united and determined will of the member nations to preserve their independence and security against any assaults.

As soon as the SEATO meeting is over, I must return to the United States to take part in President Eisenhower's meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan at Bermuda. I regret that, on this account, I shall not be able to make visits to friendly nations in the area as I have done in connection with the previous SEATO Council meetings.

SECRETARY DULLES' ARRIVAL STATEMENT, CANBERRA, MARCH 10¹

Press release 124 dated March 8

I am grateful for this opportunity to bring the greetings of President Eisenhower and the people of the United States to the people of Australia. I wish that the crowded schedule of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization meeting would permit me to meet with you more directly while I am in your vigorous, forward-looking country. Un-

¹ Broadcast over facilities of the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

fortunately, my stay is all too brief because of pressing events elsewhere. I can only regret that it could not have coincided with the spectacular Olympic games that helped to make Australian hospitality, efficiency, and sportsmanship a by-word among all nations.

I know that all Americans would want me to express their appreciation to the people of Australia for the comradeship and understanding you have displayed in the years in which we have shared so many common problems in the Pacific. Already our two countries have gone through much together. We have shared at times security and at times danger. We have shared prosperity and economic strain. We have rejoiced in common victories at arms. We have worked together in the hard task of seeking peace and preserving it.

It is demonstrable that our destinies are inextricably linked. The United States is not only an Atlantic power, but also, like you, we are a Pacific power. There are plenty of grave problems and major tasks that confront the Atlantic Community. But those problems do not monopolize our concern or make us indifferent to the problems of the Pacific and of Asia.

You can, I believe, feel confident that you will never stand alone in the Pacific.

There have been times in the past, and there may be times again, when we may disagree as to how best to pursue our common goal of security in a just and lasting peace. You may have taken a somewhat different view from that which we took in regard to the stormy events of last fall in the Suez area.

I can well understand why many of you felt as you did.

I hope that you will understand that the United States reacted as it did because we believe that our present worldwide responsibilities make it especially incumbent upon us to seek to uphold the United Nations principle that force shall not be used against a country as a means of settling international disputes. But we equally believe that the United Nations must not only seek that international disputes be settled peacefully but that they be settled in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. There lie ahead many heavy tasks in this respect. In these I know we shall be working side by side.

One of the most cherished values we hold in common, indeed one of the reasons for the strong

attraction between us, is the belief in government of laws—our conviction that governments must give expression to the moral convictions of their people. So long as we both follow the course that moral principle dictates, we will inevitably walk close together along the road.

The fact that Australia and the United States share so many beliefs is one of the free world's strong guaranties for security. We both believe, for example, that many of the difficulties facing the free nations can be resolved, particularly if each nation will do its utmost to establish justice even when its own interests are not directly involved. Much can be done through cooperation and resourcefulness. Much can be done through patience and peaceful determination. The blessings of peace and freedom are well worth the price.

The United Nations, despite its present imperfections, is a power and force for world peace with justice. I believe the United Nations has gained greatly in prestige and influence. Our belief is strengthened that it will eventually realize the potential for peace envisaged by its founders.

The very mission which brings me to Australia is evidence of our mutual faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter. That charter made wise provision for collective security arrangements as a deterrent to aggression. It was a similar mission that brought me here in 1951. You may recall that I then discussed with your Prime Minister and the Minister for External Affairs the first multilateral regional security pact which the United States was to enter in this part of the world. This was the tripartite security pact between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States which we have come to know as the ANZUS Treaty. I am proud to have been able to take a part in its formulation and to be one of the signers of that treaty on which we, as you do, place great value.

Now the United States and Australia and New Zealand have become partners and allies in another organization—the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Both ANZUS and SEATO were established within the framework of the United Nations Charter for the primary purpose of insuring a just peace in the Pacific and Southeast Asia. The United States is proud to hold membership in both. Neither is a substitute for the other.

Australia and the United States, both bordering on the Pacific Ocean, have legitimate and fundamental interests in preserving the peace of the area. Good sense and prudence dictate that we form collective defense associations between ourselves and with other freedom-loving nations of the area to demonstrate that we are determined to resist aggression. That today, in practical terms, means Communist aggression and, in this area, means primarily Chinese Communist aggression.

Chinese communism still remains formidable. But we are convinced that it is increasingly evident that it does not represent in this part of the world the "wave of the future."

There was a time when Western Europe was dominated by the fear that Soviet communism might represent the "wave of the future." Now no one thinks that, not even the Communist parties in western European countries, which used to be so boastful. We have seen, notably in Hungary and in Poland, that, even though Soviet communism has had many years' rule in which to seek by every means to inculcate its doctrine, it is nevertheless rejected by the people. It does not and cannot satisfy their aspirations. Even within Russia itself, where communism has ruled for 40 years, there is growing restlessness and resistance to the conformity which communism seeks to impose.

Inevitably the same defects of communism will make themselves manifest in Asia. The free peoples of Asia need not look upon Chinese communism as the "wave of the future" in Asia and the western Pacific. It, too, will stumble over its own inherent defects.

However, we cannot be complacent.

At the most recent North Atlantic Council meeting in Paris, it was the consensus that the threat of Communist aggression had not diminished despite the facade of smiles of Communist rulers. The cruel repression in Hungary revealed the sharp teeth behind the smiles. I feel likewise that in the area covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty the threat remains. It can be met only by our unity in strength.

It is my conviction that, so long as we remain resolute, the measures that we have taken and are taking will carry us safely through the present critical period. The fact of United States-Australian solidarity as an integral part of free-world

security enables me to make this statement with greater confidence.

May I once more express my great pleasure at being in Australia again and at being closely as-

sociated once more with your Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, and your Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Casey, for both of whom I have the highest and most cordial regard.

Second Annual Report of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization¹

FOREWORD

This is the second annual report of the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation. It is published by the SEATO Council Representatives in preparation for the meeting of the Council of Ministers at Canberra in March, 1957. It records the progress made during 1956 and sets out SEATO's plans and hopes for the future.

The South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty was signed at Manila on September 8, 1954,² and came into force on February 19, 1955, when it had been ratified by the eight signatory countries—Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The work of SEATO has been greatly assisted by the Royal Thai Government, which provided a building in Bangkok for the Headquarters of the Organisation. This building was opened by the Prime Minister H. E. Field Marshal Pibulsonggram on June 24, 1956, the Thai National Day.³

INTRODUCTION

The past year has been on the whole one of quiet and steady development in the SEATO member countries. Achievements in many fields were made possible by the relative stability of the Treaty Area—a situation which the existence of SEATO has helped to create. SEATO is a bulwark against aggression in all its forms and enables the peoples of the Area which it serves to live their

daily life in an atmosphere of freedom from fear. Indeed the very existence of such a collective security system, by giving confidence to our countries, has enabled them to devote to economic, social and cultural development a greater portion of their resources than would have been possible had each of them provided separately for its own defence. This in itself is ample justification for the existence of SEATO and visible evidence of its value to our countries.

When SEATO was established the principal threat to the Treaty Area was that of armed aggression. It has, however, been clear for some time that the Communists have for the moment at least changed their tactics, although we cannot overlook the continuing growth of Communist military strength, particularly in Communist China and North Vietnam. Subversion, which has always been a major problem, is the main threat we now face. To the identification of this threat, and its exposure, and to the development of counter-measures, SEATO has devoted much of its effort in 1956.

SEATO as an Organisation, and the member countries individually, have also sought to give expression to those aspects of the Treaty relating to economic, social and cultural progress and to devise schemes of cooperation and mutual help suited to the particular needs of the countries of the Area. Such willing cooperation has fostered the spirit of partnership which has become a feature of all aspects of SEATO's work.

SEATO's members have not, however, been lulled into complacency by the progress so far made. The threat to the whole area still remains serious and they are all aware that vigilance is as necessary as ever; but they face the future with faith in one another and confidence in their organisation for collective defence.

¹ Released on Mar. 5 at Canberra, Paris, Wellington, Karachi, Manila, Bangkok, London, and Washington.

² BULLETIN of Sept. 20, 1954, p. 393.

³ *Ibid.*, July 2, 1956, p. 10.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

We have kept under close and continuous review the developments affecting the security of the Treaty Area, and during the past year our expert advisers carried on their studies on various aspects of the Communist threat. While it is not appropriate for us to publish detailed information of this nature, we have set out below a general description of current Communist tactics.

The relative stability which prevailed in the Treaty Area should not obscure the fact that the Communist threat has assumed a more insidious, but equally dangerous, form. While retaining and extending their capacity to commit armed aggression, the Communists are for the present relying on a wide range of more subtle tactics, both political and economic, to achieve their ends. As a result the danger of overt aggression is less apparent, but we cannot assume that the Communists have finally renounced force. The brutal Soviet repression of the Hungarian uprising is eloquent testimony to that fact. Nor must it be forgotten that the Chinese Communist Government has given the Soviet Union wholehearted and unqualified support in its use of force in Hungary to maintain its central domination of the policies of the countries of the Communist bloc.

Despite statements stressing the feasibility of peaceful co-existence between Communist and non-Communist nations, Communist official pronouncements, including the declarations of recent Party Congresses, make it clear that the ultimate objective in the Treaty Area continues to be the establishment of disciplined Communist regimes.

The Communists have also sought to exploit "neutrality". They have attempted to identify the widespread desire of peoples for national independence and integrity with the policy of neutrality. They have also supported neutralist claims that membership with other free nations in regional collective defence organisations is incompatible with national independence. In so doing, the Communists hope, by keeping up the outmoded cries of "imperialism" and "colonialism", to weaken the present friendly ties between Asian and other free countries and among Asian nations themselves, and so to increase their own influence and to mask the enlargement of their own empire.

Critics of collective defence arrangements disregard the fact that every country has the inherent

right of individual and collective self-defence and that this right is expressly recognised by the Charter of the United Nations.

We have observed that the main effort of the Communists to subvert the peoples of countries in the Treaty Area consists in the infiltration of political, youth and cultural movements and trade unions. At the same time the Communists have directed their political activity towards two objectives. Where the Communist party is illegal, they have aimed at legalisation of the party so that they may re-enter national political life. In those countries where the party is legal, they have tried to promote the formation of coalition or inter-party alliances of united front elements with a view to gaining control of Governments.

They continue also to make use of "front" organisations, which mask their Communist character and aims behind a facade of ostensibly respectable organisational names and purposes. Every effort is made to entice well known non-Communists into membership of these groups to lend an air of respectability to such groups. During the past year international fronts such as the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), International Union of Students (IUS), and World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) intensified their efforts to influence Asian groups in support of Communist objectives. Asian Solidarity Committees formed in some countries were representative of other new "front" vehicles for Communist exploitation. United front activities were also exemplified by the new offers advanced by those Asian Communists still carrying forward the "armed struggle", to abandon violence if the established governments would legalise Communist Party activities.

The Communists have also tried to stimulate "front" organisations on a regional basis or, where regional organisations already exist, to infiltrate and exploit them. To this end they have attempted to form or to penetrate Asian-African Trade Union movements and such other activities as Asian Writers Conferences, Asian-African Economic Conferences, and Asian-African Students Conferences. For example, there is ample evidence to indicate that Communists tried to gain control of the recent Asian-African Students' Conference in Bandung in order to influence its deliberations and declarations for political purposes.

Other important targets of Communist subversive efforts during the past year were the minority groups in the countries of the Area, in particular the Overseas Chinese communities in these countries. The vast majority of those people of Chinese ancestry are, of course, peaceful, law-abiding and respectable members of the societies in which they live. But the Communists have attempted to recruit possible subversive agents from amongst them and to extort financial support by various forms of coercion, often directed at relatives on the Chinese mainland. Efforts have also been made to induce Chinese youth to return to the Chinese mainland for education. In many cases, this education has amounted to little more than indoctrination.

During the past year Communist countries have continued and intensified their "economic offensive" in Asia, with Communist China now entering the field of economic aid with the support of the USSR. While SEATO members do not question the right of any country to seek new markets for its exports or to expand the volume and change the pattern of its trade, there is strong evidence indicating that the Communist countries have adopted trade and aid policies largely for political ends. In pursuit of these ends, they have publicised their economic aid out of proportion to its actual volume, which is far less than that afforded Asian nations by SEATO's members alone.

Far from attempting to contribute to the policy of a general expansion of international trade, Communist economic tactics show a desire to disrupt normal trading patterns and to divert trade into a Communist dominated economic bloc. Frequently, these tactics are both economically unsound and inconsistent with a professed desire to foster friendly international relations.

Aid agreements with the Communist countries have the added danger that they often permit the entry into the country accepting aid of "experts" whose presence opens up new channels for espionage and subversion. Some trade agreements have had the effect of tying down substantial percentages of national productive capacities with consequent loss of normal trade opportunities and increased dependence on Communist countries. There is thus a danger that dependence on Communist production and technical capacity may become permanent, giving the Communists a much desired political lever.

Such then is the nature of the Communist threat in South-East Asia—an integrated subversive attack in all fields of national life to undermine the stability of free nations and thus prepare them for Communist domination. Behind this campaign of subversion stand Communist armed forces, which have been steadily increased and which are so disposed as to be ready for use at a moment's notice should armed aggression once again better suit Communist aims.

THE YEAR'S WORK

SEATO is concerned with the protection of the nations of the Area against both subversion and overt aggression. To this end, cooperative efforts are required to identify and expose Communist subversive tactics, and to assist Member Governments in the necessary counter-measures. In addition, adequate defensive strength must be created and maintained to deter any would-be aggressor.

At the same time, under the protection provided by their collective security arrangements, Member Governments have a responsibility to their peoples to press forward with their programmes of economic, social and cultural advancement. In all these fields, SEATO has also been active during the year under review.

Action To Counter Subversion

Responsibility for dealing with subversion in SEATO countries rests with the national authorities. We are able to report that the member countries have taken vigorous measures to counter subversive activities. In those areas where Communist terrorists and armed bands exist, governments have made good progress with their campaigns to reduce the threat presented by these groups. National authorities also dealt successfully with Communist-inspired rioting and other demonstrations. The effectiveness of these measures is shown by the fact that Communism has made no substantial progress in member countries during the year under review, although the situation in the Treaty Area as a whole is less satisfactory.

In carrying out these counter-measures, Member Governments have been assisted firstly by working arrangements with other member countries in respect of training assistance, border control, and exchange of information; and secondly by the

work done at SEATO Headquarters in analysing the nature and extent of subversion and the methods employed by the Communists.

In the field of mutual cooperation, a notable feature has been the close collaboration among the police forces of the Treaty Area. A particular example is the work of the police forces of Thailand and Malaya in cooperating to put down armed Communist terrorism along the Thai-Malay border. Member countries are also collaborating in the provision of police and special branch training. The Philippines has assisted some of the countries covered by the Treaty in training personnel in counter-subversion work. Regular exchanges of information on Communist subversive activities and on counter-measures have also made national efforts more effective.

During the past year, we have undertaken in a number of ways to assist Member Governments in countering Communist tactics. We have established a Research Service Centre within the Permanent Organisation to conduct research on current Communist aims and tactics. We have also directed the SEATO expert committees to make studies of various aspects of the Communist threat, such as the penetration of youth movements and other selected groups, and the dangers arising from Communist economic activities in the Area. The results of these studies, accompanied by appropriate recommendations, have been made available to SEATO Member Governments. In addition, our regular meetings and periodic exchanges of views on the Communist threat to the area have provided a very useful forum for exchanges of information on topics related to counter-subversion.

Action To Increase Defensive Strength

Although the present emphasis in Communist tactics remains on subversion, SEATO cannot afford to relax its efforts to plan resistance to overt aggression. It must ensure that no aggressor can rely upon lack of cohesion in the military planning of member nations. Responsibility for this task falls primarily on the Military Advisers who have in the past year made significant progress towards the attainment of this objective. The following meetings were held during the year:—

Military Advisers' Meeting, Melbourne, January, 1956.

March 25, 1957

Military Advisers' Extraordinary Meeting, Karachi, March, 1956.

Staff Planners' Meeting, Singapore, June, 1956.

Military Advisers' Meeting, Baguio, September, 1956.

Finance Meeting, Bangkok, October, 1956.

Intelligence Meeting, Singapore, December, 1956.

Communications Meeting, Pearl Harbour, January, 1957.

Preliminary planning has reached an advanced stage, and accordingly a Permanent Military Planning Staff is now being set up at SEATO Headquarters in Bangkok. This will enable detailed planning for collective defence of the Area to be expedited and to proceed on a continuing basis. This staff will be headed by Brigadier General Alfredo M. Santos of the Philippines, and will consist of an equal number of military planners from the armed services of all Member Nations. The Military Secretariat will be combined with this Planning Staff.

Another important part of the Military Advisers' work is to ensure that the armed forces of the member countries learn to work together. With this in mind, two major joint training exercises were held in 1956, as well as a number of smaller bilateral exercises. Exercise FIRM-LINK, in which naval, ground and air forces took part, was held in and around Bangkok in February. It included demonstrations of the landing of troops from helicopters, dropping of parachutists, supplies and equipment and attacks by aircraft against ground targets. The exercise ended with a march past in Bangkok of representative contingents. A SEATO maritime training exercise, ALBATROSS, took place in September and October, ranging through the South China Sea to Bangkok and Manila. It involved a series of progressively more advanced exercises to develop teamwork and operational procedures. In October, a landing exercise, TEAMWORK, involving Thai and United States forces, took place at Hard Chao Samran in Thailand. Finally operation RIDHEE, a joint air-ground staff exercise was held at Don Muang Air Port, Thailand, in January, 1957. The Military Advisers have provided continuity in this type of training by means of annual schedules of combined training exercises.

In addition, member countries have pressed ahead with their own training programmes to

improve the efficiency of all branches of their forces. In this they have also received considerable assistance from other members. Training missions and advisory groups have been exchanged and facilities have been provided in the training schools of member nations for students from the others. This is resulting in the building up of a pool of well-trained specialists which will not only benefit the armed forces of the member countries now, but also the economy of those countries at a later stage when the men return to civil life.

Apart from this assistance in training, extensive programmes for the provision of equipment and technical assistance on a bilateral basis are being implemented.

The lesson of this cooperation between free nations within a collective defence system is clear. By mutual assistance in training and provision of equipment it is possible for member countries to build up far more effective forces than they would individually have been able to do.

Economic Progress and Cooperation

During the past year the Asian members of SEATO—Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand—made significant progress in the economic, social and cultural fields. So did the countries covered by the Protocol to the Treaty.⁴

These advances indicate the effectiveness of the combination of self-help and mutual aid among SEATO members. A major part of this achievement resulted from the efforts of member countries themselves. All three Asian members have reported that there was significant expansion of their economies during 1956. Pakistan, for example, allocated for development projects during the year nearly three times the total amounts spent in previous years. In the Philippines, activity was concentrated on the expansion of mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation, farm production, and electric power. The major emphasis in Thailand was on projects designed to improve basic services such as highways, irrigation, civil aviation, and seed improvement. These countries have also played their part in assisting in the economic development of the area as a whole. Thailand provided transit, training and

other facilities to Laos, while the Philippines sent technical experts to Vietnam for economic and social development programmes.

This economic progress has been greatly assisted by the expanded volume of economic assistance extended to the countries served by the Treaty by other SEATO members. Some \$620 million was made available during the past year to help to carry out such basic economic development projects as road building, the installation of irrigation equipment, the purchase of agricultural machinery, the improvement of livestock and the establishment of new industries. This brings to well over \$1,000 million the total of economic and technical assistance allocated, mainly under bilateral arrangements, to countries covered by the Treaty in the two years since SEATO was established.

Australia, for example, provided the Asian member countries and those covered by the Protocol to the Treaty with capital aid for development projects. The value of the equipment provided in 1956 was \$2 million and commitments have been made to provide a considerable volume of additional aid in coming years. France made available some \$18.5 million to assist countries covered by the Treaty. New Zealand allocated \$1 million in the form of capital aid to Asian countries covered by the Treaty during the year. In addition to substantial financial and technical assistance to its own territories, the United Kingdom furnished a total of \$9.4 million to member countries in the Area.

The United States, as in previous years, extended, under bilateral agreements, large amounts of economic aid to countries covered by the Treaty. This assistance, in various forms, totalled \$584 million in the United States fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Moreover, in the two fiscal years since the Treaty came into being, United States defence support and technical assistance to the Asian member states has increased considerably as compared with the two fiscal years immediately preceding the beginning of SEATO.

The increase in economic aid during the year was matched by a corresponding increase in the level of technical and other forms of assistance. For example, 124 trainees went to Australia from member countries and the other countries covered by the Treaty. France made available to the countries covered by the Treaty the service of 108 experts, and provided some 275 scholarships to those

⁴ Laos, Cambodia and the Republic of Vietnam. [Footnote in the original.]

countries for study and training in France. Other scholarships in various fields such as administration, telecommunications, transport, public health and social welfare, have also been offered to the Asian members of SEATO under French programmes of assistance designed to give concrete help in the implementation of SEATO aims. New Zealand provided training courses for 50 students from the three Asian member countries and the United Kingdom allocated \$56,000 for technical assistance to States covered by the Protocol to the Treaty. The United States continued its extensive technical cooperation programmes in all the countries concerned; on June 30 there were more than 400 trainees in the United States from the Treaty Area.

As in past years, SEATO members and the States covered by the Treaty also benefited from assistance provided through the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies.

Within the Organisation, valuable basic studies have been made by the SEATO Committee of Economic Experts on the problems facing member nations in improving their defence capacity without prejudice to the rate of their economic development. During the past year these studies were further developed by SEATO's expert advisers with the assistance of the SEATO Economic Officer. For example, a Joint Civil/Military Study Group met to examine the problems of improving maintenance and rebuild capacities in sectors of defence industries where deficiencies exist. Another study group is considering measures required to remedy in Asian member countries the shortage of skilled labour existing in their military and civil production and resulting from their defence efforts. Moreover, consideration has also been given to the problems existing in areas and social groups which are economically weak and particularly susceptible to Communist subversive activities.

A particularly noteworthy development during the year was the Australian Government's offer of \$4.5 million for a programme of economic aid for SEATO defence. This is the first substantial aid programme initiated specifically under a SEATO label and its purpose is to strengthen the defence capacities of member countries, and so of SEATO as a whole, by helping to fill the needs of their defence services with equipment and services from Australian resources. Requests for such defence support aid within the \$2.24 million allocated for

bilateral aid were invited from the Governments of Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand and these are now being processed.

Social and Cultural Progress

Progress was likewise registered in the cultural, educational, labour and information fields. While the achievements recorded were for the most part due to the individual effort of the member countries, there was a growing awareness of the need for more effective joint action in these fields.

Cultural exchanges among SEATO nations improved mutual understanding and provided additional opportunities for education and training. In Australia, for example, foreign-student clubs have promoted goodwill between Australia and the respective SEATO countries. The Alliance Francaise has provided libraries in various countries, while the French Government has facilitated travel by professors and experts in the cultural field in the Treaty Area. Both Thailand and the Philippines have participated in various international cultural activities and have received numerous goodwill visits from member countries in the Treaty Area. The United Kingdom has sponsored training, study, and observation visits to Singapore and Malaya from almost all countries of South-East Asia as well as providing training in Britain for post-graduate students from the Area. The United States has announced a special programme of SEATO grants, and has continued to provide in its extensive cultural programme in the Treaty Area for numerous exchanges of scholars, teachers and students with member nations and the countries protected by the Treaty.

In the information field also member countries continued to make available to one another a considerable amount of technical assistance, communications equipment and training facilities. Australia supplied Pakistan with telecommunications equipment and will furnish films and projectors. France has continued to assist some States in the Area with the provision of technicians in the radio field and has also provided courses in France for specialists in radio and motion pictures. New Zealand has offered to accept candidates from member countries for training in film production. Groups of journalists, technicians and administrators from Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam visited Sing-

apore and Malaya. The United States continued its programme of providing technical assistance in the information field and training in technical and information skills.

By their own efforts, supplemented by aid extended under bilateral projects, the member countries in the Area also strengthened their educational programmes.

In all our countries progress was made in fostering the growth of free trade unions and in other ways promoting the welfare of workers. In Thailand there was an outstanding development. This was the enactment of a new Labour Law setting forth basic standards of working conditions, union activity and industrial relations. The Philippines is planning revision of its 1953 Labour Law and is continuing its programme of labour education. In New Caledonia emphasis has been placed on measures leading to better social well-being. France and the United Kingdom have continued to provide assistance to other member countries in the labour field, and exchanges of labour specialists were intensified in the Treaty Area.

A valuable role in the co-ordination and guidance of the developing activities of member countries in the information, cultural, educational and labour fields is being played by the appropriate SEATO committee of experts and the Organisation's Public Relations and Cultural Relations Offices. The Committee on Information, Cultural, Education and Labour Activities continued its studies of the requirements of member countries for assistance in these fields and of the extent to which other members could give aid of this kind. A substantial information programme was drawn up for implementation by the Organisation and by Member Governments and preliminary study has been made of a cultural programme to be undertaken under SEATO auspices.

THE CIVIL ORGANISATION

The overall controlling body for SEATO is the *Council*, consisting of ministerial representatives from member countries who meet at least once a year to make policy decisions for the Organisation, to state general objectives, and to assess progress toward those objectives.

The *Council Representatives*, consisting of the heads of diplomatic missions of member countries,

meet at SEATO Headquarters in Bangkok to maintain continuing consultation on matters relating to the Treaty and to supervise the work of the Organisation.

The growing scope and usefulness of the civil side of the Organisation was reflected in the increase during the past year in our activities as well as in those of the SEATO bodies working under our direction. We had twenty-four regular meetings, as well as periodic exchanges of views on the general security situation in the Treaty Area.

The *Permanent Working Group*, which was established in mid-1956 as a result of a Council decision at its Karachi meeting, has been of invaluable assistance to us. Meeting almost daily, it is composed of members from the staff of each Council Representative and performs the essential task of sifting and giving preliminary consideration to proposals brought forward in the Organisation. During the year, the Group made a study of the overall implications of current international Communist tactics in South-East Asia.

The substantive work of the offices and expert committees of the Organisation during the past year is for the most part covered in previous sections of the Report. The following description of the activities of these bodies is intended to provide a simple outline of the present SEATO Civil Organisation.

The three expert committees, which are composed of qualified delegations from each member nation, did valuable work during the year.

The *Committee of Economic Experts* has completed a number of valuable studies and has prepared recommendations for the consideration of member countries.

The *Committee of Security Experts*, an expert group dealing with certain problems of Communist subversion directed from without the Treaty Area, held two meetings during the year and played a key role in the counter-subversion effort of SEATO.

The *Committee on Information, Cultural, Education and Labour Activities* which has also met twice since the Council meeting at Karachi last year, again provided a useful forum for expert consideration of various problems confronting Member Governments in these fields.

To meet our growing requirements, and to carry out the SEATO programmes we have developed, a *Permanent Organisation* was established in SEATO's Bangkok Headquarters last June, and now

comprises a total of 16 international officers and 45 other employees. It includes:

The Executive Secretariat, headed by Nai Vadhana Isarabhakdi of Thailand, which provides the civil side of the Organisation with general administrative and budgetary support, including the servicing of SEATO Headquarters, provides a conference secretariat for meetings, and ensures that all SEATO bodies and delegations are kept informed of activities relevant to their work.

The Public Relations Office, headed by Mr. Narciso G. Reyes of the Philippines, which is responsible for the Organisation's press relations and for the SEATO Information Programme.

The Cultural Relations Office, headed by Mr. Louis-Jacques Rollet-Andriane of France, which is responsible for carrying out the cultural programme.

The Economic Office, headed by Mr. Abul Fazl Atwar Husain of Pakistan, which assists the Organisation with economic matters affecting the implementation of the Treaty.

The Research Service Centre, directed by Mr. Hadi Hussain of Pakistan, which produces reports on current developments in Communist activities for the use of Member Governments and of the various SEATO bodies.

THE TASK AHEAD

SEATO's main task, as set out in the Treaty, is "to strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, and to promote the economic well-being and development of all peoples in the Treaty Area" in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The fact that substantial progress has been made toward these ends is a source of satisfaction to the SEATO nations. They are, however, aware that powerful forces, controlled by Communist dictatorships in close military alliance, are still seeking domination of the free world. In Asia the armies employed not long ago for aggressive ends in Vietnam and Korea remain in being.

These forces, now held in check by the defensive strength of the free nations, retain their capacity to commit aggression, and are a standing reminder of the continuing need for vigilance in the Treaty Area.

March 25, 1957

In the meantime an all-out campaign of subversion is being waged in the Treaty Area and every device is being used to weaken the free nations therein so that the eventual Communist domination of South and South-East Asia may be secured.

The challenge to SEATO is accordingly a continuing one. It is a challenge that can only be met by full use of SEATO's capabilities as an instrument of defence and collective security and by progress towards a better life for all peoples protected by the Treaty.

U.S. Begins Cultural Exchanges Under SEATO Pact

Press release 112 dated March 5

The U.S. Government has inaugurated a program of cultural exchanges in direct support of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. While basically a collective security pact, the treaty also provides for cooperation in the economic, social, and cultural fields. The program now being implemented is designed to strengthen the alliance through the fostering of closer cultural and intellectual ties between the peoples of the United States and the other member states. It is similar to one which has been carried out with NATO nations for the past 5 years.

The announcement that the United States intended to implement this special program was made by Secretary Dulles at the second meeting of the SEATO Council of Ministers held at Karachi last year.¹ The treaty itself was signed at Manila in September 1954. The organization's member states are Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Col. Taquid Deen Ahmad, Surgeon General of the Government of East Pakistan, is the first exchangee. He arrived at Washington on February 14 and will spend 2 months in the United States. During this time, he will consult with colleagues in the medical profession and visit hospitals and research centers in various parts of the country.

¹ For text of communique issued at the close of the Karachi meeting of the SEATO Council, together with statements by Secretary Dulles, see BULLETIN of Mar. 19, 1956, p. 447. For text of second annual report of SEATO, see p. 496.

Other participants in the special program who have just arrived in Washington are J. C. Lyne of New Zealand, senior reporter for the *Auckland Star*, and Mrs. Luisa H. Linsangan of the Philippines, editor of a weekly women's magazine. They will be followed by another Pakistani leader who is expected to arrive within the next few days, Kaz-e-man Ahmad Naqvi, news editor of Radio Pakistan. All will spend 2 to 3 months here. Their time will be devoted to exchanges of views with Americans in various parts of the United States and general observations on this country's life and institutions, as well as consultations with their professional colleagues.

In addition to these visits by individuals, a group project will be initiated under the special SEATO program in June. At that time, five journalists representing Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand will visit this country in a group.

The SEATO cultural exchange program is being carried out as a part of the Department's International Educational Exchange Program.

Travel to Far East Reaches Peak in 1956

Expenditures by American travelers in the Far East reached an all-time high in 1956, the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, reported on February 24. Expenditures made in the Far East, Southeast Asia, and Oceania by traveling residents of the United States during the first half of 1956 were estimated at an annual rate of \$45 million, 35 percent above 1955. Spending in this area represented about 6 percent of total expenditures of U.S. travelers in all overseas areas.

The rise in 1956 resulted mainly from an increase in the number of travelers from the 1955 figure. Some increase also occurred in per capita outlays by travelers. Expenditures as recorded exclude payments for transportation between the United States and the countries visited.

Over half of the travel expenditures in the area were made in Japan, showing the effect of heavy travel by American residents of Japanese ancestry. Hong Kong ranked second, with travel expenditures there including large amounts spent on goods imported duty-free from other countries to this British colony.

Three-fourths of U.S. travelers to the Far East during the first 6 months of 1956 went by air, as against 70 percent in 1955. Of these, one-third traveled in groups of two or more persons, the rest traveling alone. On the other hand, half of the sea travelers went in groups.

Pleasure travelers accounted for two-fifths of total travelers. More than twice as many pleasure travelers used planes as used ships. Business travelers, comprising a little more than one-quarter of all travelers, used planes in nearly all cases. Travelers on visits to relatives—28 percent of all travelers—preferred to go by ship.

President Transfers O. C. B. to National Security Council

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

White House press release dated February 25

The President on February 25 issued an Executive order placing the Operations Coordinating Board within the structure of the National Security Council. The order will become effective when appropriations of the National Security Council for the next fiscal year become available for the support of the Board.

The Operations Coordinating Board was originally established by Executive order of the President on September 2, 1953,¹ to improve inter-agency coordination in carrying out national security policies, and as a separate interagency group reporting to the National Security Council. Under the Executive order of February 25, the President, while continuing the present functions of the Board, has formally placed the Board within the structure of the National Security Council; this is done with the objective of providing a closer relation between the formulation and carrying out of security policies.

The offices of the Operations Coordinating Board have been moved to space adjacent to the offices of the National Security Council in the Executive Office Building. Staff of the Board will be transferred with the Board to the National Security Council.

The Executive order also designates for the first time the Director of the International Coopera-

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 28, 1953, p. 420.

tion Administration as a member of the Operations Coordinating Board. Currently, the Director participates actively in the work of the Board without the status of a member of the Board.

The President has previously announced that he will designate Christian A. Herter as Chairman of the Board and Robert Cutler as Vice Chairman of the Board when the new order becomes effective. They are both currently serving in these positions.

The other members of the Board are Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., Deputy Secretary of Defense; Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence; and Arthur Larson, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10700¹

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. (a) In order to assist in the effective coordination among certain agencies of certain functions relating to the national security and to provide for the integrated implementation of national security policies by the said agencies, there is hereby established within the structure of the National Security Council the Operations Coordinating Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board, which shall report to the National Security Council.

(b) The Board shall have as members the following: (1) the Under Secretary of State, who shall represent the Secretary of State, (2) the Deputy Secretary of Defense, who shall represent the Secretary of Defense, (3) the Director of Central Intelligence, (4) the Director of the United States Information Agency, (5) the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and (6) one or more representatives of the President to be designated by the President. The Board shall have a chairman and a vice chairman, each of whom shall be designated by the President from among its members. Each head of agency referred to in items 1 to 5, inclusive, in this subsection may provide for an alternate member who shall serve as a member of the Board in lieu of the regular member representing the agency concerned whenever such regular member is, for reasons beyond his control, unable to attend any meeting of the Board.

(c) The head of any agency (other than any agency represented under section 1(b) hereof) to which the President from time to time assigns responsibilities for the implementation of national security policies shall assign a representative to serve on the Board when the Board is dealing with subjects bearing directly upon the responsibilities of such head. Each such representative shall be an Under Secretary or corresponding official.

Each such head may provide for an alternate representative of his agency who shall attend any meeting of the Board, requiring representation of such agency, in lieu of the representative when the latter is, for reasons beyond his control, unable to attend.

(d) Any alternate member of the Board serving under section 1(b) of this order, and any representative or alternate representative serving under section 1(c) of this order, shall, while so serving, have in all respects the same status on the Board as the members of the Board provided for in section 1(b) hereof.

Section 2. The President having approved any national security policy after receiving the advice of the National Security Council thereon, the Board shall (1) whenever the President shall hereafter so direct, advise with the agencies concerned as to (a) their detailed operational planning responsibilities respecting such policy, (b) the coordination of the interdepartmental aspects of the detailed operational plans developed by the agencies to carry out such policy, (c) the timely and coordinated execution of such policy and plans, and (d) the execution of each security action or project so that it shall make its full contribution to the attainment of national security objectives and to the particular climate of opinion the United States is seeking to achieve in the world, and (2) initiate new proposals for action within the framework of national security policies in response to opportunity and changes in the situation. The Board shall perform such other advisory functions as the President may assign to it and shall from time to time make reports to the National Security Council with respect to the carrying out of this order.

Section 3. Subject to the provisions of section 101(c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 402(c)):

(a) (1) The Board shall have, within the staff of the National Security Council, such staff as may be necessary to assist the Board in the performance of its functions, (2) the said staff of the Board shall be headed by an Executive Officer of the Board, and (3) employees of agencies may, consonant with law, be detailed to the aforesaid staff of the Board.

(b) Members of the staff of the Operations Coordinating Board provided for in Executive Order No. 10483, as amended, who are immediately prior to the taking effect of this order receiving compensation directly out of funds available to the said Board shall be transferred to the staff of the Board referred to in paragraph (a) of this section as of the effective date of this order. The said transfers shall be accomplished in consonance with applicable law, including the last proviso of section 12 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 861).

(c) Appropriate arrangements may be made for the detail to the staff of the Board referred to in paragraph (a) of this section of employees of agencies who are immediately prior to the taking effect of the provisions of this order detailed to the staff of the Operations Coordinating Board provided for in Executive Order No. 10483, as amended.

¹ 22 Fed. Reg. 1111.

Section 4. As used herein, the word "agency" may be construed to mean any instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including any executive department.

Section 5. Nothing in this order shall be construed either to confer upon the Board any function with respect to internal security or to abrogate or restrict in any manner any function vested by law in, or assigned pursuant to law to, any agency or head of agency (including the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization).

Section 6. This order supersedes Executive Order No. 10483 of September 2, 1953, and provisions amendatory thereof contained in other Executive orders (including, to the extent that it relates to the Operations Coordinating Board provided for in Executive Order No. 10483, the proviso of section 303 (b) of Executive Order No. 10610 of May 9, 1955). Subject to the provisions of this order (including the limitations imposed by section 3 hereof), the Board may be deemed to be a continuation of the Operations Coordinating Board provided for in Executive Order No. 10483, as amended.

Section 7. The foregoing provisions of this order shall become effective on July 1, 1957, except that if funds appropriated for the National Security Council shall not have become available on that date for the support of the Board in consonance with this order, the said provisions shall become effective on such later date as funds so appropriated become so available.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 25, 1957.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

84th Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions

Investigation Into the Activities of Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers. Supplement to the hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. 33 pp.

84th Congress, 2d Session

Control and Reduction of Armaments. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to S. Res. 93, S. Res. 185, and S. Res. 286. Part 10, December 12, 1956, St. Louis, Mo. 192 pp.

Tariff Treatment of Wool and Mica. Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 6299, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings; H. R. 12227, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on wool. December 15 and 17, 1956. 121 pp.

85th Congress, 1st Session

Control and Reduction of Armaments. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to S. Res. 93, S. Res. 185, and S. Res. 286. Part 11, January 9 and 10, 1957, Washington, D.C. 138 pp.

The President's Proposal on the Middle East. Hearings before the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services on S. J. Res. 19 and H. J. Res. 117. Part I, January 14-February 4, 1957, 612 pp.; Part II, February 5-11, 1957, 347 pp.

Control and Reduction of Armaments. Report to accompany S. Res. 61. S. Rept. 11, January 23, 1957. 1 p.

Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund. Letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a report showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956, pursuant to Public Law 724, 79th Congress. H. Doc. 78, January 23, 1957. 3 pp.

Second NATO Parliamentary Conference. Report of the United States House delegation to the Paris Conference of NATO Parliamentarians, November 19-23, 1956. H. Rept. 26, February 4, 1957. 16 pp.

Annual Report of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Message from the President transmitting the report of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress. H. Doc. 88, February 6, 1957. 28 pp., maps.

Protocol With Canada With Respect to the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in Fraser River System. Message from the President transmitting the protocol between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada to the convention for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser River System, signed at Washington on the 26th day of May 1930, which protocol was signed at Ottawa on December 28, 1956. S. Exec. C, February 11, 1957. 6 pp.

Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea. Message from the President transmitting a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Seoul on November 28, 1956. S. Exec. D, February 11, 1957. 16 pp.

Inventory Report on Real Property Owned by the United States Throughout the World as of June 30, 1956. Prepared by General Services Administration at the request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. S. Doc. 25, February 11, 1957. 144 pp.

To Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East. Report of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services on S. J. Res. 19. S. Rept. 70, February 14, 1957. 11 pp.

Protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. Message from the President transmitting the protocol to the international convention for the regulation of whaling, signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 19, 1956, for the United States of America and 16 other governments. S. Exec. E, February 14, 1957. 6 pp.

Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Message from the President transmitting the protocol to the international convention for the Northwest Atlantic fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of June 25, 1956, for the United States of America and nine other governments. S. Exec. F, February 18, 1957. 4 pp.

United Nations Expresses Hope for Resumed Negotiations on Cyprus

*Statement by James J. Wadsworth
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly*¹

More than 2 years have passed since the question of Cyprus was first discussed in the United Nations. Painfully little progress has been made toward the solution of the problem which so deeply involves the people of that troubled island. Three of our closest friends are concerned.

Last year the United States emphasized its belief that "quiet diplomacy" was the most constructive approach in this case.² We still hold that view.

The United States pledged last year to take an active interest in the question of Cyprus. We fulfilled that pledge. During the past year we have taken advantage of every opportunity to facilitate negotiations among those concerned. Nevertheless, the problem continues to agitate relations among them. This does not change our conviction that the possibility of successful settlement depends upon the willingness of those involved to reach an understanding through negotiations undertaken on their own initiative.

As in most international problems, there is no dearth of practical solutions. As the charter explicitly recognizes, however, it is incumbent upon the parties to any dispute to seek first to achieve agreement on a solution through direct negotiations. The United States believes that those concerned in this case should explore still further processes of negotiation outside the United Nations, since they cannot have eliminated all prospective solutions. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, we cannot seriously contend that there is any virtue in our trying in these circum-

stances to endorse one or another solution as the one most likely to succeed.

All of us here have reason to appreciate that there is no one, simple, clear-cut solution in problems of this character. This is an issue which has involved deep emotion and created tension. The need obviously is for patient consideration and thoughtful study in a spirit of mutual cooperation.

The prospect for success of negotiation, in this or any other case, depends in large part on the atmosphere in which they are undertaken. The United States strongly hopes that moderation and forbearance will be exercised by those most directly concerned in the months ahead.

Equally important in maintaining an atmosphere conducive to successful negotiation are stability and tranquillity in the area directly involved. Violence or any external interference will only heighten tension and lead to more violence. We hope that all those concerned recognize the necessity of maintaining the kind of atmosphere in which negotiation can be pursued and will make every effort to this end.

We believe also that a settlement in Cyprus should be designed to win the wholehearted cooperation of the people of the island. In this connection we refer to the joint declaration of June 1954 made by President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill, then the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.³

The criterion which we shall apply to any proposals submitted to the Committee is the extent to which they will enable us to conclude our discussion without further aggravating the situation and rendering more difficult an eventual settlement. The important thing is to find the proper method of approach to the problem which will be a constructive step forward, and finding this method of approach, we believe, is up to those concerned. In this regard the United States Government is prepared to assist the governments and peoples concerned, with all of whom we have the closest friendship.

We now have before us three draft resolutions.⁴ The United States does not believe that any of these resolutions would contribute to a so-

¹ Made in Committee I (Political and Security) on Feb. 20 (U.S. delegation press release 2622).

² For a statement by U.S. Representative Henry Cabot Lodge in the General Committee on Sept. 21, 1955, see BULLETIN of Oct. 3, 1955, p. 545.

³ For text, see *ibid.*, July 12, 1954, p. 49.

⁴ U.N. docs. A/C.1/L.168, introduced by Greece; A/C.1/L.169, introduced by the U.K.; and A/C.1/L.170, introduced by Greece.

Resolution on Cyprus¹

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Cyprus,

Believing that the solution of this problem requires an atmosphere of peace and freedom of expression,

Expresses the earnest desire that a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the hope that negotiations will be resumed and continued to this end.

¹ U.N. doc. A/Res/486 (A/C.1/172), adopted in plenary session on Feb. 26 by a vote of 55 to 0, with 1 abstention (Afghanistan).

lution of the Cyprus problem. We believe on the contrary that the adoption of these resolutions—any of them—irrespective of their possible merits, would exacerbate the situation. We very much hope that the sponsors will not press them to a vote. If the sponsors heed this appeal with respect to the resolutions now before us, it may be possible for us to complete our discussions without further aggravating the situation and rendering more difficult an eventual settlement.⁵

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade

The Department of State announced on March 7 (press release 120) that the United States will be represented by the following delegation at the ninth session of the Committee on Industry and Trade of the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), which will convene at Bangkok, Thailand, March 7 to 15:

Chairman

Walter M. Kotschnig, Director, Office of International Economic Affairs, Department of State, and Deputy U.S. Representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council

⁵ On Feb. 21 a fourth draft resolution was introduced by Panama (A/C.1/L. 171). On Feb. 22 a fifth draft resolution, introduced by India (A/C.1/L. 172), was given priority in the voting and was adopted by Committee I by a vote of 76-0-2. The representatives of Greece, the U.K., and Panama thereupon announced that they would not press their respective draft resolutions to a vote.

Vice Chairman

Eugene M. Braderman, Director, Far Eastern Division, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce

Advisers

David A. Andrews, Minerals Adviser, U.S. Operations Mission, Djakarta, Indonesia

William Diehl, Chief, Far Eastern Division, Office of International Finance, Department of the Treasury

George R. Jacobs, First Secretary of Embassy, Bangkok, Thailand

Elton L. Nelson, Office of the Deputy Director, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor

John R. O'Brien, Policy Adviser, Office of Assistant Director for Far East, U.S. Information Agency

William C. Ockey, Deputy Director, Office of North Asian Affairs, Department of State

Rufus Burr Smith, Officer-in-Charge, Economic Affairs, Office of South Asian Affairs, Department of State

Stokes M. Tolbert, Economic Analyst, U.S. Operations Mission, Bangkok, Thailand

At its forthcoming session, the Committee will consider a number of important topics upon which it will make recommendations to the Commission, which is scheduled to hold its 13th session at Bangkok from March 18 to 28.

The question of increased industrialization will be reflected in the reports of the subcommittees on electric power and mineral resources development, both of which will point up the demand for raw materials and increased availability of power for their conversion and processing. Other elements in the problems created by industrialization—trained labor and housing for workers—will be brought out in reports of working parties on specific aspects of these general subjects.

In connection with a report of the study tour of electric power experts to Europe and North America, a group of 11 technicians from the region engaged in a 12-week study tour of Russia, Sweden, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States. During the United States phase of the tour in the fall of 1956, the study group was escorted by representatives of the International Cooperation Administration and the Detroit Edison Company to important electric power installations in the United States.

The Committee will also consider the report of the second session of the subcommittee on trade, which met at Tokyo in the fall of 1956, at which the United States was represented by a delegation headed by E. E. Schnellbacher, director of the

Office of Trade Promotion, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The Committee on Industry and Trade is composed of the 22 member states and 3 associate members of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Trusteeship Council

Provisional Agenda of the Nineteenth Session of the Trusteeship Council to be convened at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 14 March 1957, at 11 a. m. T/1297, February 5, 1957. 59 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

International Classification of Hard Coals by Type. Prepared by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe. Geneva, August 1956. 52 pp. printed.

Economic Commission for Latin America. Trade Committee. Payments and the Regional Market in Inter-Latin-American Trade. Analysis and recommendations. E/CN.12/C.1/4, August 13, 1956. 35 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Inland Transport Committee. Activities in the Field of Inland Waterways. Progress report by the Executive Secretary. E/CN.11/Trans/124, November 16, 1956. 7 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Latin America. Trade Committee. Report Submitted by the Trade Committee to the Economic Commission for Latin America. E/CN.12/C.1/7, November 29, 1956. 74 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Access of Women to Education. Report by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/287, December 4, 1956. 25 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Committee on Industry and Trade. Report of the Subcommittee on Trade (Second Session) to the Committee on Industry and Trade (Ninth Session). E/CN.11/I&T/120, December 11, 1956. 54 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Committee on Industry and Trade. Report of the Working Party on Housing and Building Materials (Fourth Meeting) to the Committee on Industry and Trade (Ninth Session). E/CN.11/I&T/127 Corr. 1, December 18, 1956. 1 p. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Information Concerning the Status of Women in Trust Territories. Report by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/288, December 18, 1956. 8 pp. mimeo.

Development of International Travel, Its Present Increasing Volume and Future Prospects. Addendum to the note by the Secretary-General. E/2933/Add.1, December 20, 1956. 8 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Inland Transport Committee. Activities in the Field of Highways. Progress report by the Executive Secretary. E/CN.11/Trans/125, December 31, 1956. 5 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Technical Assistance: Summary of Selected Projects Affecting the Status of Women. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/289, January 2, 1957. 37 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Inland Transport Committee. Assistance Provided by the United Nations Technical Assistance Administra-

tion in the Field of Inland Transport in 1956. Note by the Technical Assistance Administration. E/CN.11/Trans/127, January 2, 1957. 4 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Inland Transport Committee. Report of the ECAFE/FAO Working Party on Railway Track (Wooden) Sleepers. E/CN.11/Trans/Sub.1/47, January 2, 1957. 28 pp. mimeo.

Freedom of Information. Media of Information in Under-Developed Countries. Report by the Secretary-General. E/2947, January 4, 1957. 18 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Provisional Agenda for the Eleventh Session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Note by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/290, January 8, 1957. 6 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Access of Women to Education. Report prepared by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. E/CN.6/291, January 9, 1957. 14 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Information Concerning the Status of Women in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Report by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/293, January 14, 1957. 10 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

International Court of Justice

Statute of the International Court of Justice (59 Stat. 1055).

Notice of withdrawal of recognition of compulsory jurisdiction deposited: India, February 8, 1957.

Weights and Measures

Convention for the creation of an international office of weights and measures. Signed at Paris May 20, 1875. Entered into force January 1, 1876. 20 Stat. 709. *Accession deposited:* India, January 11, 1957.

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement relating to navigation improvements in Canadian waters of the Detroit River section of the Great Lakes connecting channel. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa July 23 and October 26, 1956, and February 26, 1957. Entered into force October 26, 1956.

Agreement amending the agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy of June 15, 1955 (TIAS 3304). Signed at Washington June 26, 1956. *Entered into force:* March 4, 1957 (date on which each Government received from the other notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements).

Iran

Agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington March 5, 1957. Enters into force on the day on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has

complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Nicaragua

Agreement for performance by members of Army and Air Force Missions of duties specified in article V of the military assistance agreement of April 23, 1954 (TIAS 2940). Effected by exchange of notes at Managua January 17 and February 9, 1957. Entered into force February 9, 1957.

Venezuela

Agreement for exemption of merchant vessels from requirements of admeasurement by port authorities. Effected by exchange of notes at Caracas February 21, 1957. Entered into force February 21, 1957.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Confirmations

The Senate on January 25 confirmed Ellsworth Bunker to be Ambassador to India. (For biographic details, see press release 611 dated December 7, 1956.)

Designations

Harry F. Stimpson, Jr., as Special Assistant to the Under Secretary, effective January 23.

John Wesley Jones as Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, effective February 14.

William R. Tyler as Director, Office of Western European Affairs, effective February 14.

George L. West, Jr., as Deputy Director, Office of Western European Affairs, effective February 14.

John M. Raymond as Deputy Legal Adviser, effective March 1. (For biographic details, see press release 109 dated March 4.)

Joseph C. Satterthwaite as Director General of the Foreign Service. (For biographic details, see press release 106 dated March 2.)

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: March 4-10

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press release issued prior to March 4 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 102 of March 1.

No.	Date	Subject
†107	3/4	<i>Foreign Relations</i> volume.
108	3/4	IACPR subcommittees meet.
*109	3/4	Raymond appointed Deputy Legal Adviser (biographic details).
110	3/5	Dulles: Israeli withdrawal (combined with No. 111).
111	3/5	Dulles: news conference transcript.
112	3/5	Cultural exchanges under SEATO.
113	3/5	Recognition of Ghana.
114	3/5	Dulles-Von Brentano communique.
115	3/5	Dulles: Middle East resolution.
†116	3/6	U.S.-Iran atomic agreement.
117	3/6	Dulles: departure statement.
118	3/6	Four-Power Working Group on German reunification.
†119	3/7	U.S. contribution to malaria eradication.
120	3/7	Delegation to ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade (rewrite).
*121	3/7	Educational exchange.
†122	3/7	U.S.-Mexican air transport agreement.
123	3/8	Murphy: "Interlocking Elements in Our National Security."
124	3/8	Dulles: radio greeting to people of Australia.
†125	3/8	Foreign Service examination.
126	3/9	Ambassador Richards' departure for Middle East.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

American Principles. Interlocking Elements in Our National Security (Murphy)	475
American Republics. Representatives of American Presidents Prepare for Final Meeting	479
Asia	
ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade (delegation) .	508
Travel to Far East Reaches Peak in 1956	504
U.S. Begins Cultural Exchanges Under SEATO Pact . .	503
U.S. Delegation Leaves To Attend Third Meeting of SEATO Council (Dulles, delegation)	493
Austria. Eximbank Credit to Austria	491
China, Communist	
Interlocking Elements in Our National Security (Murphy)	475
Second Annual Report of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization	496
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5	482
Communism	
Interlocking Elements in Our National Security (Murphy)	475
Second Annual Report of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization	496
Congress, The	
Congress Passes Joint Resolution on Middle East (Eisenhower, Dulles)	480
Congressional Documents	506
Joint Resolution To Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East	481
U.S.-U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945 (Eisenhower, text of amendment)	492
Department and Foreign Service	
Confirmations (Bunker)	510
Designations (Stimpson, Jones, Tyler, West, Raymond, Satterthwaite)	510
Economic Affairs	
Eximbank Credit to Austria	491
Second Annual Report of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization	496
Travel to Far East Reaches Peak in 1956	504
U.S.-U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945 (Eisenhower, text of amendment)	492
Educational Exchange. U.S. Begins Cultural Exchanges Under SEATO Pact	
	503
Egypt. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5 .	482
Europe. Working Group on Germany and European Security	491
Germany	
German Foreign Minister Visits United States	490
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5	482
Working Group on Germany and European Security . .	491
Ghana	
Ghana Becomes 81st Member of United Nations (Lodge)	490
New State of Ghana (Eisenhower)	489

India. Confirmations (Bunker)	510
International Organizations and Conferences	
ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade (delegation) .	508
U.S. Delegation Leaves To Attend Third Meeting of SEATO Council (delegation)	493
Israel. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5 .	482
Middle East	
Congress Passes Joint Resolution on Middle East (Eisenhower, Dulles)	480
Interlocking Elements in Our National Security (Murphy)	475
Joint Resolution To Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East	481
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5	482
United Nations Expresses Hope for Resumed Negotiations on Cyprus (Wadsworth, text of resolution)	507
Mutual Security. Second Annual Report of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization	
	496
Presidential Documents	
Congress Passes Joint Resolution on Middle East . . .	480
New State of Ghana	489
President Transfers O.C.B. to National Security Council	504
U.S.-U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945	492
Protection of Nationals and Property. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of March 5	
	482
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	509
U.S.-U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945 (Eisenhower, text of amendment)	492
U.S.S.R. Interlocking Elements in Our National Security (Murphy)	475
United Kingdom. U.S.-U.K. Agree To Amend Financial Agreement of 1945 (Eisenhower, text of amendment) .	492
United Nations	
Current U.N. Documents	509
ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade (delegation) .	508
Ghana Becomes 81st Member of United Nations (Lodge) .	490
United Nations Expresses Hope for Resumed Negotiations on Cyprus (Wadsworth, text of resolution)	507

Name Index

Bunker, Ellsworth	510
Dulles, Secretary	480, 482, 490, 493
Eisenhower, President	480, 489, 492, 504
Jones, John Wesley	510
Lodge, Henry Cabot	490
Murphy, Robert	475
Raymond, John M	510
Richards, James P	481
Satterthwaite, Joseph C	510
Stimpson, Harry F., Jr	510
Tyler, William R	510
von Brentano, Heinrich	490
Wadsworth, James J	507
West, George L., Jr	510



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

The American Ambassador . . .

This 22-page pamphlet discusses the role of America's highest ranking diplomatic official, the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The pamphlet corrects prevalent misconceptions about the operations of American posts abroad and presents a brief historical discussion of American diplomacy from the earliest days of the Nation to the present time. Other sections deal with the American woman in diplomacy and the requirements for the ideal ambassador in today's world.

Publication 6420

10 cents

The American Agricultural Attaché . . .

In an expanding world community, American agriculture needs information on agricultural developments in other countries, assurance that the foreign market for American agricultural products will be maintained and promoted, and representation at the international level. All three functions are performed by the 85 agricultural attachés in 54 countries throughout the world. This 23-page pamphlet contains an account of the development of the agricultural attaché service and a discussion of each of the functions of the attaché. A final section covers the requirements, salaries, and assignment periods for the career service of the agricultural attaché.

Publication 6422

15 cents

Both of these pamphlets are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me ... copies of *The American Ambassador* and ... copies of *The American Agricultural Attaché*.

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

